

SPEECH

7

OF

MR. HORACE MANN,

ON

THE RIGHT OF CONGRESS TO LEGISLATE

FOR THE

TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES,

AND

Its Duty to Exclude Slavery Therefrom.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, JUNE 30, 1848.

REVISED EDITION.

BOSTON:
WILLIAM B. FOWLE.
1848.

SPEECH

OF

MR. HORACE MANN,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, JUNE 30, 1845,

ON THE RIGHT OF CONGRESS TO LEGISLATE FOR THE TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES, AND ITS DUTY TO EXCLUDE SLAVERY THEREFROM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have listened with interest, both yesterday and to-day, to speeches on what is called the "Presidential Question." I propose to discuss a question of far greater magnitude, — the question of the age, — one whose consequences will not end with the ensuing four years, but will reach forward to the setting of the sun of time.

Sir, our position is this: The United States finds itself the owner of a vast region of country at the West, now almost vacant of inhabitants. Parts of this region are salubrious and fertile. We have reason to suppose, that, in addition to the treasures of wealth which industry may gather from its surface, there are mineral treasures beneath it, — riches garnered up of old in subterranean chambers, and only awaiting the application of intelligence and skill to be converted into the means of human improvement and happiness. These regions, it is true, lie remote from our place of residence. Their shores are washed by another sea, and it is no figure of speech to say that another sky bends over them. So remote are they, that their hours are not as our hours, nor their day as our day; and yet, such are the wonderful improvements in art, in modern times, as to make it no rash anticipation, that, before this century shall have closed, the inhabitants on the Atlantic shores will be able to visit their brethren on the Pacific in ten days; and that intelligence will be transmitted and returned between the Eastern and the Western oceans in ten minutes. That country, therefore, will be rapidly filled, and we shall be brought into intimate relations with it, and, notwithstanding its distance, into proximity to it.

Now, in the providence of God, it has fallen to our lot to legislate for this unoccupied, or but partially occupied, expanse. Its great Future hangs upon our decision. Not only degrees of latitude and longitude, but vast tracts of time, — ages and centuries, — seem at our disposal. As are the institutions which we form and establish there, so will be the men whom these institutions, in their turn, will form. Nature works by fixed laws; but we can bring this or that combination of circumstances under the operation of her laws, and thus determine results. Here springs up our responsibility. One class of institutions will gather there one class of men, who will develop one set of characteristics; another class of institutions will gather there another class of men, who will develop other characteristics. Hence, their futurity is to depend upon our present course. Hence, the acts we are to perform seem to partake of the nature of creation, rather than of legislation. Standing upon the elevation which we now occupy, and looking over into that empty world, "yet void," if not "without form," but soon to be filled with multitudinous life, and reflecting upon our power to give form and character to that life, and almost to foreordain what it shall be, I feel as though it would be no irrever-

ence to compare our condition to that of the Creator before he fashioned the "lord" of this lower world ; for we, like Him, can ingraft one set of attributes, or another set of attributes, upon a whole race of men. In approaching this subject, therefore, I feel a sense of responsibility corresponding to the infinite, — I speak literally, — the *infinite* interests which it embraces.

As far as the time allowed me will permit, I propose to discuss two questions. The first is — "*Whether Congress can lawfully legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories.*"

On this question a new and most extraordinary doctrine has lately been broached. A new reading of the Constitution has been discovered. It is averred that the 3d section of the 4th article, giving Congress power "to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," only gives power to legislate for the land *as land*. It is admitted that Congress may legislate for the land *as land*, — geologically or botanically considered, — perhaps for the beasts that roam upon its surface, or the fishes that swim in its waters ; but it is denied that Congress possesses any power to determine the laws and the institutions of those who shall inhabit that "land."

But compare this with any other object of purchase or possession. When Texas was admitted into the Union, it transferred its "navy" to the United States ; in other words, the United States bought, and of course owned, the navy of Texas. What power had Congress over this navy, after the purchase ? According to the new doctrine, it could pass laws for the hull, the masts, and the sails of the Texan ships, but would have no power to navigate them by officers and men. It might govern the ships as so much wood, iron, and cordage, but would have no authority over commanders or crews.

But we are challenged to show any clause in the Constitution which confers an *express* power to legislate over the Territories we possess. I challenge our opponents to show any clause which confers express power to acquire those territories themselves. If, then, the power to acquire exists, it exists by implication and inference ; and if the power *to acquire* be an implied one, the power *to govern what is acquired* must be implied also. For, for what purpose does any man acquire property but to govern and control it ? What does a buyer pay for, if it be not the right to "dispose of ?" Such is the doctrine of the Supreme Court of the United States : "The right to govern," says Chief Justice Marshall, "may be the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire." *Amer. Ins. Co. vs. Canter*, 1 *Peters*, 542. See also *McCullough vs. Maryland*, 4 *Wheat.*, 422. *The Cherokee Nation vs. Georgia*, 5 *Peters*, 44. *United States vs. Gratiot*, 14 *Peters*, 537.

But I refer to the express words of the Constitution, as ample and effective in conferring all the power that is claimed. "Congress may dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations," &c. If Congress may "dispose of" this land, then it may sell it. Inseparable from the right to sell is the right to define the terms of sale. The seller may affix such conditions and limitations as he pleases to the thing sold. If this be not so, then the buyer may dictate his terms to the seller. Answer these simple questions : Supposing the United States to own land in fee-simple, then, is the government under guardianship, or disabled by minority ? Is it *compos mentis* ? If none of these disabilities apply to it, then it may sell. It may sell the fee-simple, or it may carve out any lesser estate, and sell that. It may incorporate such terms and conditions as it pleases into its deed or patent of sale. It may make an outright quit-claim, or it may reserve the minerals for its own use, or the navigable streams for public highways, as it has done in the territory north-west of the river Ohio. It may insert the conditions and limitations in each deed or patent ; or, where the grantees are numerous, it may make general "rules and regulations," which are understood to be a part of each contract, and are therefore binding upon each purchaser. No man is compelled to buy ; but if any one does buy, he buys subject to the "rules and regulations" expressed in the grants ; and neither he, nor his grantees, nor his or their heirs after them, can complain. I want, therefore, no better foun-

dation for legislating over the Territories than the fact of ownership in the United States. Grant this, and all is granted. If I own a farm, or a shop, I may, as owner, prescribe the conditions of its transfer to another. If he does not like my conditions, then let him abandon the negotiation; if he accedes to the conditions, then let him abide by them, and hold his peace.

Sir, in the State to which I belong, we hold Temperance to be a great blessing, as well as a great virtue; and Intemperance to be a great curse, as well as a great sin. I know of incorporated companies there, who have purchased large tracts of land for manufacturing purposes. They well know how essential is the sobriety of workmen to the profitableness of their work; they know, too, how wasteful and destructive is inebriety. In disposing of their land, therefore, to the men whom they would gather about them and employ, they incorporate the provision, as a fundamental article in the deed of grant, that ardent spirits shall never be sold upon the premises; and thus they shut up, at once, one of the most densely thronged gateways of hell. Have they not a right to do so, from the mere fact of ownership? Would any judge or lawyer doubt the validity of such a condition; or would any sensible man ever doubt its wisdom or humanity? Pecuniarily and morally, this comes under the head of "needful rules and regulations." If tipplers do not like them, let them stagger away, and seek their residence elsewhere.

But the United States is not merely a land-owner; it is a Sovereignty. As such, it exercises all constitutional jurisdiction over all its Territories. Whence, but from this right of sovereignty, does the Government obtain its power of saying that no man shall purchase land of the natives, or aborigines; and that, if you wish to buy land in the Territories, you shall come to the Government for it? Is there any express power in the Constitution authorizing Congress to say to all the citizens of the United States, "If you wish to buy ungranted land in the Territories, you must come to us, for no one else can sell, or shall sell?" This right, sustained by all our legislation and adjudications, covers the whole ground. *Lessee of Johnson et al. vs. McIntosh*, 8 Wheaton, 543; 5 Cond. Re., 515.

But, leaving the Constitution, it is denied that there are precedents. The honorable gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BAYLY] has not only contested the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories, but he has denied the existence of precedents to sustain this power. Sir, it would have been an assertion far less bold, to deny the existence of precedents for the election of a President of the United States; for the instances of the latter have been far less frequent than of the former. Congress has legislated on the subject of slavery in the Territories all the way up, from the adoption of the Constitution to the present time; and this legislation has been sustained by the judiciary of both the General and State Governments, and carried into execution by the Executive power of both. See *Menard vs. Aspasia*, 5 Peters, 505; *Phebe et al. vs. Jay*, Breese's Re., 210; *Hogg vs. the Zanesville Canal Co.*, 5 Ohio Re., 410; *Martin's Louisiana Re.*, N. S. 699; *Spooner vs. McConnell*, 1 McLean's Re., 341; *Harvey vs. Decker*, *Walker's Mississippi Re.*, 36; *Rachael vs. Walker*, 4 Missouri Re., 350.

So far as the uniform practice of sixty years can settle a doubtful, or confirm an admitted right, this power of legislating over the Territories has been taken from the region of doubt, and established upon the basis of acknowledged authority. In legislating for all that is now Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida, we have legislated on the subject of slavery in the Territories. Sixty years of legislation on one side, and not a denial of the right on the other.

But the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BAYLY] says, that the action of Congress, in regard to the Territories, has been rather that of constitution-making than of law-making. Suppose this to be true; does not the greater include the less? If Congress could make a constitution for all the Territories,—an organic, fundamental law,—a law of laws,—could it not, had it so pleased, make the law itself? A constitution prescribes to the legislature what it shall do, and what it shall not do; it commands, prohibits, and binds men by oaths

to support itself. It says, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further." And if Congress can do this, can it not make the local law itself? Can aught be more preposterous? As if we could *command* others to do what we have no right to do ourselves, and prohibit others from doing what lies beyond our own jurisdiction. Surely, to decree on what subjects a community shall legislate, and on what they shall not legislate, is the exercise of the highest power.

But Congress has not stopped with the exercise of the constitution-making power. In various forms, and at all times, it has legislated for the Territories, in the strictest sense of the word *legislation*. It has legislated again and again, and ten times again, on this very subject of slavery. See the act of 1794, prohibiting the slave trade from "any port or place" in the United States. Could any citizen of the United States, under this act, have gone into one of our Territories and there have fitted out vessels for the slave trade? Surely he could, if Congress had no right to legislate over Territories only as so much land and water.

By statute 1798, chapter 28, § 7, slaves were forbidden to be brought into the Mississippi Territory from without the United States, and all slaves so-brought in *were made free*.

So the act of 1800, chapter 51, in further prohibition of the slave trade, applied to all citizens of the United States, whether living in Territories or in organized States. Did not this legislation cover the Territories?

By statute 1804, chapter 38, § 10, three classes of slaves were forbidden to be introduced into the Orleans Territory.

Statute 1807, chapter 22, prohibiting the importation of slaves after January 1, 1808, prohibited their importation into the Territories in express terms.

Statute 1818, chapter 91, statute 1819, chapter 101, and statute 1820, chapter 113, prohibiting the slave trade, and making it piracy, expressly included all the Territories of the United States.

Statute 1819, chapter 21, authorized the President to provide for the safe-keeping of slaves imported from Africa, and for their removal to their home in that land. Under this law, the President might have established a depot for slaves within the limits of our Territories, on the Gulf, or on the Mississippi.

By statute 1820, chapter 22, § 8, Congress established what has been called the Missouri compromise line, thereby expressly legislating on the subject of slavery. So of Texas. See *Jo. Res. March 1, 1845*.

By statute 1819, chapter 93, statute 1821, chapter 39, § 2, and statute 1822, chapter 13, § 9, Congress legislated on the subject of slavery in the Territory of Florida.

Does it not seem almost incredible that a defender and champion of slavery should deny the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories? If Congress has no such power, by what right can a master recapture a fugitive slave escaping into a Territory? The Constitution says: "No person held to service, or labor, in one *State*, escaping into another,"—that is, another *State*,—"shall be discharged from such service, or labor," &c. The act of 1793, chapter 7, § 3, provides that when a person "held to labor," &c., "shall escape into any other of the said States, or Territory," he may be taken. By what other law than this can a runaway slave be retaken *in a Territory*? If Congress has no power to legislate on the subject of slavery in any Territory, then, surely, it cannot legislate for the capture of a fugitive slave in a Territory. The argument cuts both ways. The knife wounds him who would use it to wound his fellow.

Further than this. If slavery is claimed to be one of the common subjects of legislation, then any legislation by Congress for the Territories, on any of the common subjects of legislation, is a precedent, going to prove its right to legislate on slavery itself. If Congress may legislate on one subject belonging to a class, then it may legislate on any other subject belonging to the same class. Now, Congress has legislated for the Territories on almost the whole circle of subjects belonging to common legislation. It has legislated

on the elective franchise, on the pecuniary qualifications and residence of candidates for office, on the militia, on oaths, on the *per diem* and mileage of members, &c. &c. By statute 1811, chapter 21, § 3, authorizing the Territory of Orleans to form a constitution, it was provided that all legislative proceedings and judicial records should be kept and promulgated in the English language. Cannot Congress make provision for the rights of the people, as well as for the language in which the laws and records defining those rights shall be expressed? Any language is sweet to the ears of man which gives him the right of trial by jury, of habeas corpus, of religious freedom, and of life, limb, and liberty; but accursed is that language, and fit only for the realms below, which deprives an immortal being of the rights of intelligence and of freedom; of the right to himself, and the dearer rights of family.

But all this is by no means the strongest part of the evidence with which our statutes and judicial decisions abound, showing the power of Congress to legislate over Territories. From the beginning, Congress has not only legislated over the Territories, but it has appointed and controlled the agents of legislation.

The general structure of the Legislature in several of the earlier Territorial Governments was this: It consisted of a Governor and of two Houses, an upper and a lower. Without an exception, where a Governor has been appointed, Congress has always reserved his appointment to itself, or to the President. The Governor so appointed has always had a veto power over the two Houses; and Congress has always reserved to itself, or to the President, a veto power, not only over him, but over him and both the Houses besides. Congress has often interfered also with the appointment of the upper House, leaving only the lower House to be chosen exclusively by the people of the Territory; and it has determined even for the lower House the qualifications both of electors and of elected. Further still: The power of removing the Governor, at pleasure, has always been reserved to Congress, or to the President.

Look at this: Congress determines for the Territory the qualifications of electors and elected,—at least in the first instance. No law of the Territorial Legislature is valid until approved by the Governor. Though approved by the Governor, it may be annulled by Congress, or by the President; and the Governor is appointed, and may be removed at pleasure, by Congress or by the President.

To be more specific, I give the following outline of some of the Territorial Governments:

Ohio Territory, statute 1789, chapter 8. — A governor for four years, nominated by the President, approved by the Senate, with power to appoint all subordinate civil and military officers.

A Secretary for four years, appointed in the same way.

Three Judges, to hold office during good behavior. Governor and Judges the sole Legislature, until the district shall contain 5,000 free male inhabitants. Then,

A House of Assembly, chosen by qualified electors, for two years.

A Legislative Council of five, to hold office for five years. The House of Assembly to choose ten men, five of whom are to be selected by the President and approved by the Senate. These five to be the "Legislative Council."

A Governor, as before, with an unconditional veto and a right to convene, prorogue, and dissolve the Assembly.

Power given to the President to revoke the commissions of Governor and Secretary.

Indiana Territory, statute 1800, chapter 41. — Similar to that of Ohio. At first the lower House to consist of not more than nine, nor less than seven.

Mississippi Territory, statute 1800, chapter 50. — Similar to that of Indiana.

Michigan Territory, statute 1805, chapter, 5. — Similar to that of Indiana.

Illinois Territory, statute 1809, chapter 13. — Similar to that of Indiana.

Alabama Territory, statute 1817, chapter 59. — Similar to that of Indiana.

Wisconsin Territory, statute 1836, chapter 54. — Governor for three years, appointed as above, and removable by the President, with power to appoint officers and grant pardons. Unconditional veto.

Secretary for four years, removable by the President. In the absence, or during the inability, of the Governor, to perform his duties.

Legislative Assembly to consist of a Council and a House of Representatives, to be chosen for two years. Congress to have an unconditional veto, to be exercised on laws approved by the Governor.

Louisiana Territory, statute 1803, chapter 1. — Sole dictatorial power given to the President of the United States; and the army and navy of the United States placed at his command to govern the territorial inhabitants. — (This was under Mr. Jefferson, a strict constructionist.)

Territory of Orleans, statute 1804, chapter 38. — Governor nominated by the President, approved by the Senate, tenure of office three years. Removable by the President. Secretary for four years, to be Governor in case, &c.

Legislative Council of thirteen, to be annually appointed by the President.

Governor and Council, of course, a reciprocal negative on each other. Congress an unconditional veto on both.

District of Louisiana, statute 1804, chapter 38. — To be governed by the Governor and Judges of the Territory of Indiana.

Congress an unconditional veto on all their laws.

Missouri Territory, statute 1812, chapter 95. — A Governor, appointable and removable as above.

Secretary, the same.

A Legislative Council of nine. Eighteen persons to be nominated by the House of Representatives for the Territory; nine of these to be selected and appointed by the President and Senate. A House of Representatives to be chosen by the people.

Arkansas Territory, statute 1819, chapter 49. — A Governor and Secretary, appointable and removable, as above.

All legislative power vested in the Governor and in the judges of the superior court.

When a majority of the *freeholders* should elect, then they might adopt the form of government of Missouri.

East and West Florida, statute 1819, chapter 93. — *Statute 1821, chapter 29.* — *Statute 1822, chapter 13.* — From March 3, 1819, to March 30, 1822, the Government vested solely in the President of the United States, and to be exercised by such officers as he should appoint.

After March 30, 1822, a Governor and Secretary appointable and removable as above.

All legislative power vested in the Governor, and in thirteen persons, called a Legislative Council, to be appointed annually by the President.

Yet, sir, notwithstanding all this legislation of Congress for the Territories, on the subject of slavery itself; notwithstanding its legislation on a great class of subjects of which slavery is acknowledged to be one; notwithstanding its appointment in some cases, of the legislative power of the Territory, — making its own agent, the Governor, removable at pleasure, — giving him a veto in the first place, and reserving to itself a veto when he has approved; notwithstanding the exercise, in other cases, of full, absolute sovereignty over the inhabitants of the Territories, and all their interests; and, notwithstanding such has been the practice of the Government for sixty years, under Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and others, it is now denied that Congress has any right to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories. Sir, with a class of politicians in this country, it has come to this, that slavery is the only sacred thing in existence. It is self-existent, like a god, and human power cannot prevent it. From year to year, it goes on conquering and to conquer, and human power cannot dethrone it.

Sir, I will present another argument on this subject, and I do not see how any jurist or statesman can invalidate it.

Government is one, but its functions are several. They are legislative,

judicial, executive. These functions are coördinate ; each supposes the other two. There must be a legislature to enact laws ; there must be a judiciary to expound the laws enacted, and point out the individuals against whom they are to be enforced ; there must be an executive arm to enforce the decisions of the courts. In every theory of government, where one of these exists, the others exist. Under our Constitution they are divided into three parts, and apportioned among three coördinate bodies. Whoever denies one of these must deny them all.

If the Government of the United States, therefore, has no right to *legislate* for the Territories, it has no right to *adjudicate* for the Territories ; if it has no right to *adjudicate*, then it has no right to *enforce* the decisions of the judicial tribunals. These rights must stand or fall together. He who takes from this Government the law-making power, in regard to Territories, strikes also the balances of justice from the hands of the judge, and the mace of authority from those of the executive. There is no escape from this conclusion. The Constitution gives no more authority to adjudge suits in the Territories, or to execute the decisions of the Territorial courts, than it does to legislate. If Congress has no power over territory, only *as land*, then what does this land want of judges and marshals ? Is it not obvious, then, that this new reading of the Constitution sets aside the whole legislative, judicial, and executive administration of this Government over Territories, since the adoption of the Constitution ? It makes the whole of it invalid. The Presidents, all members of Congress, all judges upon the bench, have been in a dream for the last sixty years, and are now waked up and recalled to their senses by the charm of a newly discovered reading of the Constitution.

Hitherto, sir, I have not directed my remarks to the actual legislation by Congress, on the subject of slavery in the Northwestern Territory, so called. That territory was consecrated to freedom by the ordinance of 1787. It has been said that the Confederation had no power to pass such an ordinance. One answer to this is, that the ordinance was a "compact," in terms, and so was adopted and ratified by the sixth article of the Constitution, under the term "engagement."

But whatever may be thought of this answer, there is another one which is conclusive. Congress has ratified the ordinance again and again. The first Congress at its first session passed an act whose preamble is as follows : "Whereas, in order that the ordinance of the United States, in Congress assembled, for the government of the territory northwest of the river Ohio, may continue to have full effect," &c. It then proceeds to modify some parts of the ordinance, and to adopt all the rest.*

In the 2d section of the act of 1800, chapter 41, establishing the Indiana Territory, it is expressly provided that its government shall be "in all respects similar to that provided by the ordinance of 1787."

In the act of 1802, chapter 40, section 5, authorizing Ohio to form a constitution and State government, this ordinance of 1787 is three times referred to as a valid and existing engagement ; and it has always been held to be so by the courts of Ohio.

So in the act of 1816, chapter 57, section 4, authorizing the erection of Indiana into a State, the ordinance is again recognized, and is made a part of the fundamental law of the State.

So in the act of 1818, chapter 67, section 4, authorizing Illinois to become a State.

So in the act of 1805, chapter 5, section 2, establishing the Territory of Michigan.

So of Wisconsin. See act of 1847, chapter 53, in connection with the constitution of Wisconsin.

But all this is tedious and superfluous. I have gone into this detail, because I understand the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BAYLY] to have

* Mr. Madison thought the original ordinance to be clearly invalid. See *Federalist*, No. 35. It is just as clear that he thought the Constitution gave validity to it. See *Federalist*, No. 43.

denied this adoption and these recognitions of the ordinance. I hazard nothing in saying that the ordinance of 1787 has been expressly referred to as valid, or expressly or impliedly reenacted, a dozen times, by the Congress of the United States; and, in the State courts of Ohio, Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Missouri, it has been adjudged to be constitutional. How, then, is it possible for any mind amenable to legal rules for the decision of legal questions, to say that Congress cannot legislate, or has not legislated, (except once or twice inadvertently,) on the subject of slavery in the Territories?

On this part of the argument, I have only a concluding remark to submit. The position I am contesting affirms generally that Congress cannot legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories. The *inexpediency* of so legislating is further advocated, on the ground that it is repugnant to Democratic principles to debar the inhabitants of the Territories from governing themselves. Must the free men of the Territories, it is asked, have laws made for them by others? No! It is anti-democratic, monarchical, intolerable. All men have the right of self-government; and this principle holds true with regard to the inhabitants of Territories, as well as the inhabitants of States.

Now, if these declarations were a sincere and honest affirmation of human rights, I should respect them and honor their authors. Did this doctrine grow out of a jealousy for the rights of man, a fear of usurpation, an assertion of the principle of self-government, I should sympathize with it, while I denied its legality. But, sir, it is the most painful aspect of this whole case, that the very object and purpose of claiming these ample and sovereign rights for the inhabitants of the Territories, is, that they may deny *all* rights to a portion of their fellow-beings within them. Enlarge, aggrandize the rights of the Territorial settlers! And why? Because, by so doing, you enable them to abolish all rights for a whole class of human beings. This claim, then, is not made for the purpose of making freemen more free, but for making slaves more enslaved. The reason for denying to Congress the power to legislate for the Territories, is the fear that Congress will prevent slavery in them. The reason for claiming the supreme right of legislation for the Territorial inhabitants, is the hope that they will establish slavery within their borders. Must not that Democracy be false, which begets slavery as its natural offspring?

If it has now been demonstrated that Congress has uniformly legislated, and can legislate, on the subject of slavery in the Territories, I proceed to consider the next question. *Is it expedient to exclude slavery from them?*

Here, on the threshold, we are confronted with the claim that the gates shall be thrown wide open to the admission of slavery into the broad western world; because, otherwise, the southern or slave States would be debarred from enjoying their share of the common property of the Union.

I meet this claim with a counter-claim. If, on the one hand, the consecration of this soil to freedom will exclude the slaveholders of the South, it is just as true, on the other hand, that the desecration of it to slavery will exclude the freemen of the North. We, at the North, know too well the foundations of worldly prosperity and happiness; we know too well the sources of social and moral welfare, ever voluntarily to blend our fortunes with those of a community where slavery is tolerated. If our demand for free territory, then, excludes them, their demand for slave territory excludes us. Not one in five hundred of the freemen of the North could ever be induced to take his family and domicile himself in a Territory where slavery exists. They know that the institution would impoverish their estate, demoralize their children, and harrow their own consciences with an ever-present sense of guilt, until those consciences, by force of habit and induration, should pass into that callous and more deplorable state, where continuous crime could be committed without the feeling of remorse.

Sir, let me read a passage from Dr. Channing, written in 1798, — fifty years ago, — when, at the early age of nineteen, he lived for some time in

Richmond, Virginia, as a tutor in a private family. While there, he wrote a letter, of which the following is an extract :

"There is one object here which always depresses me. It is *slavery*. This alone would prevent me from ever settling in Virginia. Language cannot express my detestation of it: Master and slave! Nature never made such a distinction, or established such a relation. Man, when forced to substitute the will of another for his own, ceases to be a moral agent; his title to the name of man is extinguished; he becomes a mere machine in the hands of his oppressor. No empire is so valuable as the empire of one's self. No right is so inseparable from humanity, and so necessary to the improvement of our species, as the right of exerting the powers which nature has given us in the pursuit of any and of every good which we can obtain without doing injury to others. Should you desire it, I will give you some idea of the situation and character of the negroes in Virginia. It is a subject so degrading to humanity, that I cannot dwell on it with pleasure. I should be obliged to show you every vice, heightened by every meanness, and added to every misery. The influence of slavery on the whites is almost as fatal as on the blacks themselves."

This was written fifty years ago, by a young man from New England, only nineteen years old. I know that, on all subjects of philanthropy and ethics, Dr. Channing was half a century in advance of his age. But the sentiments he expressed on this subject, at the close of the last century, are now the prevalent, deep-seated feelings of northern men, excepting, perhaps, a few cases, where these feelings have been corrupted by interest.

I repeat, then, that the north cannot shut out the south from the new Territories by a law for excluding slavery, more effectually than the south will shut out the north by the fact of introducing slavery. Even admitting, then, that the *law* is equal for both north and south, I will show that all the *equity* is on the side of the north.

Sir, from the establishment of our independence by the treaty of 1783, to the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and for years afterwards, no trace is to be found of an intention to enlarge the bounds of our Republic; and it is well known that the treaty of 1803, for acquiring Louisiana, was acknowledged by Mr. Jefferson, who made it, to be unconstitutional. In 1787, the Magna Charta of perpetual freedom was secured to the Northwest Territory. But the article excluding slavery from it had an earlier date than 1787. On the first of March, 1784, Congress voted to accept a cession from the State of Virginia of her claim to the territory northwest of the Ohio river. The subject of providing a government for this and other territory was referred to a committee consisting of Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Chase of Maryland, and Mr. Howell of Rhode Island. On the 19th of April, 1784, their report was considered. That report contained the following ever-memorable clause :

"That after the year 1800, of the Christian era, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, [they were spoken of as States, because it was always contemplated to erect the Territories into States,] otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been convicted to have been personally guilty."

Sir, we hear much said in our day of the Wilmot proviso against slavery. In former years, great credit has been given to Mr. Nathan Dane, of Massachusetts, for originating the sixth article, (against slavery,) in the ordinance of 1787. Sir, it is a misnomer to call this restrictive clause the "Wilmot proviso." It is the *Jefferson proviso*, and Mr. Jefferson should have the honor of it; and would to Heaven that our southern friends, who kneel so devoutly at his shrine, could be animated by that lofty spirit of freedom, that love for the rights of man, which alone can make their acts of devotion sacred.

But what is most material to be observed here, is, that the plan of government reported by Mr. Jefferson, and acted upon by the Congress at that time, embraced all the "western territory." It embraced all the "territory ceded, or to be ceded, by individual States to the United States." — See *Journals of Congress, April 23, 1784*. If, then, we leave out Kentucky and Tennessee, as being parts of Virginia and North Carolina, all the residue of the territory north or south of the Ohio river, within the treaty limits of the United States, was intended, by the "Jefferson proviso," to be rescued from the doom of slavery. For that proviso there were sixteen votes, and only seven against it. Yet so singularly were these seven votes distributed, and so large a majority of the States did it require to pass an act, that it was lost. The whole of the

representation from seven States voted for it unanimously. Only two States voted unanimously against it. Had but one of Mr. Jefferson's colleagues voted with him, and had Mr. Spaight, of North Carolina, voted for it, the restrictive clause in the report would have stood. But a minority of seven from the slaveholding States controlled a majority of sixteen from the free States;—ominous even at that early day of a fate that has now relentlessly pursued us for sixty years.

That vote was certainly no more than a fair representation of the feeling of the country against slavery at that time. It was with such a feeling that the "compromises of the Constitution," as they are called, were entered into. Nobody dreaded or dreamed of the extension of slavery beyond its then existing limits. Yet behold its aggressive march! Besides Kentucky and Tennessee, which I omit, for reasons before intimated, seven new slave States have been added to the Union, — Mississippi, Alabama, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, — the last five out of territory not belonging to us at the adoption of the Constitution; while only one free State, Iowa, has been added during all this time, out of such newly-acquired territory.*

But there is another fact, which shows that the slaveholders have already had their full share of territory, however wide the boundaries of this country may hereafter become.

I have seen the number of *actual slaveholders* variously estimated; but the highest estimate I have ever seen is *three hundred thousand*. Allowing six persons to a family, this number would represent a white population of eight-hundred thousand.

Mr. GAYLE, of Alabama, interrupted and said: If the gentleman from Massachusetts has been informed that the number of slaveholders is only 300,000, then I will tell him his information is utterly false.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman tell me how many there are?

Mr. GAYLE. Ten times as many.

Mr. MANN. Ten times as many! Ten times 300,000 is 3,000,000; and allowing six persons to each family, this would give a population of 18,000,000 directly connected with slaveholding; while the whole free population of the south, in 1840, was considerably less than five millions!

Mr. MEADE, of Virginia, here interposed and said, that where father or mother owned slaves, they were considered the joint property of the family. I think, if you include the grown and the young, there are about three millions interested in slave property.

Mr. MANN resumed. My data lead me to believe that the number does not now exceed two millions; but, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, the number directly connected with slaveholding must have been less than one million. Yet this one million have already managed to acquire the broad States of Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, beyond the limits of the treaty of 1783; when, at the time the "compromises of the Constitution" were entered into, not one of the parties supposed that we should ever acquire territory beyond those limits. And this has been done for the benefit (if it be a benefit) of that one million of slaveholders, against what is now a free population of fifteen millions. And, in addition to this, it is to be considered that the non-slaveholding population of the slave States have as direct and deep an interest as any part of the country, adverse to the extension

* Here Mr. HILLIARD, of Alabama, rose to ask if the South, by the Missouri compromise, had not surrendered its right to carry slavery north of the compromise line? The question was not understood. If it had been, it would have been replied, that the existence of slavery at New Orleans, and a few other places in Louisiana, at the time of the treaty with France, by no means established the right to carry it to the Pacific Ocean, if the treaty extended so far. Slavery being against natural right, can only exist by virtue of positive law, backed by force sufficient to protect it. It could not lawfully exist, therefore, in any part of Louisiana, which had not been laid out, organized, and subjected to the civil jurisdiction of the Government. Such was not the case with any part of the territory north of the compromise line; and therefore nothing was surrendered. On the other hand, in the formation of the Territorial Governments of Orleans, Missouri, Arkansas, and Florida, a vast extent of country was surrendered to slavery. And this is independent of the question, whether Congress, by the Constitution, has any more right to establish slavery *anywhere*, than it has to establish an inquisition, create an order of nobility, or anoint a king.

of slavery. If all our new territory be doomed to slavery, where can the non-slaveholders of the slaveholding States emigrate to? Are they not to be considered? Has one half the population of the slaveholding States rights, which are paramount, not only to the rights of the other half, but to the rights of all the free States besides? for such is the claim. No, sir. I say that, if slavery were no moral or political evil, yet, according to all principles of justice and equity, the slaveholders have already obtained their full share of territory, though all the residue of this continent were to be annexed to the Union, and we were to become, in the insane language of the day, "an ocean-bound Republic."

I now proceed to consider the nature and effects of slavery, as a reason why new-born communities should be exempted from it. First, let me treat of its economical or financial, and secondly, of its moral aspects.

Though slaves are said to be property, they are the preventers, the wasters, the antagonists, of property. So far from facilitating the increase of individual or national wealth, slavery retards both. It blasts worldly prosperity. Other things being equal, a free people will thrive and prosper, in a mere worldly sense, more than a people divided into masters and slaves. Were we so constituted as to care for nothing, to aspire to nothing, beyond mere temporal well-being, this well-being would counsel us to abolish slavery wherever it exists, and to repel its approach wherever it threatens.

Enslave a man, and you destroy his ambition, his enterprise, his capacity. In the constitution of human nature, the desire of bettering one's condition is the main-spring of effort. The first touch of slavery snaps this spring. The slave does not participate in the value of the wealth he creates. All he earns, another seizes. A free man labors, not only to improve his own condition, but to better the condition of his children. The mighty impulse of parental affection repays for diligence, and makes exertion sweet. The slave's heart never beats with this high emotion. However industrious and frugal he may be, he has nothing to bequeath to his children, — or nothing save the sad bonds he himself has worn. Fear may make him work, but hope — never. When he moves his tardy limbs, it is because of the suffering that goads him from behind, and not from the bright prospects that beckon him forward in the race.

What would a slave-owner at the south think, should he come to Massachusetts, and there see a farmer seize upon his hired man, call in a surgeon, and cut off all the flexor muscles of his arms and legs? I do not ask what he would think of his humanity, but what would he think of his sanity? Yet the planter does more than this when he makes a man a slave. He cuts deeper than the muscles; he destroys the spirit that moves the muscles.

In all ages of the world, among all nations, wherever the earnings of the laborer have been stolen away from him, his energies have gone with his earnings. Under the villeinage system of England, the villeins were a low, idle, spiritless race; dead to responsibility; grovelling in their desires; resistant of labor; without enterprise; without foresight. This principle is now exemplified in the landlord and tenant system of Ireland. If a tenant is to be no better off for the improvements he makes on an estate, he will not make the improvements. Look at the seigniories of New York, — the anti-rent districts as they are now called; — every man acquainted with the subject knows that both people and husbandry are half a century behind the condition of contiguous fee-simple proprietorships. All history illustrates the principle, that when property is insecure, it will not be earned. If a despot can seize and confiscate the property of his subject at pleasure, the subject will not acquire property, and thereby give to himself the conspicuousness that invites the plunder. And if this be so when property is merely insecure, what must be the effect when a man has no property whatever in his earnings? Who does not know that a slave, who can rationally hope to purchase his freedom, will do all the work he ever did before, and earn his freedom money besides? Slavery, therefore, though claiming to be a kind of property, is the bane of

property; and the more slaves there are found in the inventory of a nation's wealth, the less in value will the aggregate of that inventory be.

This is *one* of the reasons why slave labor is so much less efficient than free labor. The former can never compete with the latter; and while the greater service is performed with cheerfulness, the smaller is extorted by fear. Just as certain as that the locomotive can outrun the horse, and the lightning out-speed the locomotive, just so certain is it that he who is animated by the hopes and the rewards of freedom will outstrip the disheartened and fear-driven slave.

The intelligent freeman can afford to live well, dress decently, and occupy a comfortable tenement. A scanty subsistence, a squalid garb, a mean and dilapidated hovel, proclaim the degradation of the slave. The slave States gain millions of dollars every year from the privations, the mean food, clothing, and shelter, to which the slaves are subjected; and yet they grow rich less rapidly than States where millions of dollars are annually expended for the comforts and conveniences of the laborer. More is lost in production than is gained by privation.

A universal concomitant of slavery is, that it makes white labor disreputable. Being disreputable, it is shunned. The pecuniary loss resulting from this is incalculable. Dry up the myriad head-springs of the Mississippi, and where would be the mighty volume of waters which now bear navies on their bosom, and lift the ocean itself above its level, by their outpouring flood? Abolish those sources of wealth, which consist in the personal industry of every man, and of each member of every man's family, and that wide-spread thrift, and competence, and elegance, which are both the reward and the stimulus of labor, will be abolished with them. Forego the means, and you forfeit the end. You must use the instrument if you would have the product. Nothing but the feeling of independence, the conscious security of working for one's self and one's family, will, in the present state of the world, make labor profitable.

I know it has been recently said in this Capitol, and by high authority, that, with the exception of menial services, it is not disreputable at the south for a white man to labor. There are two ways, each independent of the other, to disprove this assertion. One of them consists in the testimony of a host of intelligent witnesses acquainted with the condition of things at the south. I might quote page after page from various sources; but, as the assertion comes from a gentleman belonging to South Carolina, I will meet it with the statements of another gentleman belonging to the same State. I refer to Mr. William Gregg, of Charleston, — a gentleman who is extensively acquainted with the social condition of men both north and south.

In that State, according to the last census, there were about 150,000 free whites, *over twelve years of age*. "Of this class," says Mr. Gregg, "fifty thousand are non-producers."* I suppose South Carolina to be as thrifty a slave State as there is, perhaps excepting Georgia; yet here is one third part of the population, old enough to work and able to work, who are idle, and of course vicious, — non-producers, but the worst kind of consumers.

Another answer to the above assertion is, that if white labor were reputable at the south, and white men were industrious, the whole country would be a garden, — a terrestrial paradise, — so far as neatness, abundance, and beauty, are concerned. *Where are the results of this respected and honored white labor?* In a country where few expenses are necessary to ward off the rigors of winter; where the richest staples of the world are produced; where cattle and flocks need but little shelter, and sometimes none; if man superadded his industry to the bounties of nature, want would be wholly unknown; competence would give place to opulence, and the highest decorations of art would mingle with the glowing beauties of nature.

But hear Mr. Gregg:

* Essays on Domestic Industry, or an Inquiry into the expediency of establishing Cotton Manufactories in South Carolina, 1845.

"My recent visit to the northern States has fully satisfied me that the true secret of our difficulties lies in the want of energy on the part of our capitalists, and ignorance and laziness on the part of those who ought to labor. We need never look for thrift while we permit our immense timber forests, granite quarries, and mines to lie idle, and supply ourselves with hewn granite, pine boards, laths, shingles, &c., furnished by the *lazy dogs of the North*; ah! worse than this; we see our back country farmers, many of whom are too lazy to mend a broken gate, or repair the fences to protect their crops from the neighbouring stock, actually supplied with their axe, hoe, and broom handles, pitchforks, rakes, &c., by the *indolent mountaineers of New Hampshire and Massachusetts*. The time was, when every old woman had her gourd, from which the country gardens were supplied with seed. We now find it more convenient to permit this duty to devolve on our careless friends, the Yankees. Even our boat-oars, and hand-spikes for rolling logs, are furnished, ready made, to our hand," &c. "Need I add, to further exemplify our excessive indolence, that the Charleston market is supplied with fish and wild game by northern men, who come out here as regularly as the winter comes, for this purpose, and from our own waters and forests often realize, in the course of one winter, a sufficiency to purchase a small farm in New England." — *Essays*, page 8.

Again :

"It is only necessary to travel over the sterile mountains of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, to learn the true secret of our difficulties." — "to learn the difference between indolence and industry, extravagance and economy. We there see the scenery, which would take the place of our unpainted mansions, dilapidated cabins, with mud chimneys, and no windows, broken-down rail fences, fields overgrown with weeds, and thrown away half exhausted, to be taken up by pine thickets; beef cattle unprotected from the inclemency of winter, and so poor as barely to preserve life." — *Essays*, page 7.

And again :

"Shall we pass unnoticed the thousands of poor, ignorant, degraded white people among us, who in this land of plenty, live in comparative nakedness and starvation? Many a one is reared in *proud South Carolina*, from birth to manhood, who has never passed a month in which he has not, some part of the time, been stinted for meat. Many a mother is there who will tell you that her children are but scantily supplied with bread, and much more scantily with meat, and if they be clad with comfortable raiment, it is at the expense of these scanty allowances of food. These may be startling statements, but they are nevertheless true; and, if not believed in Charleston, the members of our Legislature, who have traversed the State in electioneering campaigns, can attest their truth." — *Essays*, page 22.

After such statements as these; after the testimony of hundreds and hundreds of eye-witnesses; after the proofs furnished by the aggregates of products, published in our Patent Office Reports, it is drawing a little too heavily on our credulity to say that the white man at the South is industrious. Industry manifests itself by its results, as the sun manifests itself by shining.

But slavery is hostile to the pecuniary advancement of the community in another way. The slave must be kept in ignorance. He must not be educated, lest with education should come a knowledge of his natural rights, and the means of escape or the power of vengeance. To secure the abolition of his freedom, the growth of his mind must be abolished. His education, therefore, is prohibited by statute, under terrible penalties.

Now a man is weak in his muscles; he is strong only in his faculties. In physical strength, how much superior is an ox or a horse to a man; in fleetness, the dromedary or the eagle. It is through mental strength only that man becomes the superior and governor of all animals.

It was not the design of Providence that the work of the world should be performed by muscular strength. God has filled the earth and imbued the elements with energies of greater power than that of all the inhabitants of a thousand planets like ours. Whence come our necessities and our luxuries? — those comforts and appliances that make the difference between a houseless, wandering tribe of Indians in the far West, and a New England village. They do not come wholly or principally from the original, unassisted strength of the human arm, but from the employment, through intelligence and skill, of those great natural forces, with which the bountiful Creator has filled every part of the material Universe. Caloric, gravitation, expansibility, compressibility, electricity, chemical affinities and repulsions, spontaneous velocities, — these are the mighty agents which the intellect of man harnesses to the car of improvement. The application of water, and wind, and steam, to the propulsion of machinery, and to the transportation of men and merchandise from place to place, has added ten thousand fold to the actual products of human industry. How small the wheel which the stoutest laborer can turn, and how soon will he be weary. Compare this with a wheel driving a thousand spin-

dles or looms, which a stream of water can turn, and never tire. A locomotive will take five hundred men, and bear them on their journey hundreds of miles in a day. Look at these same five hundred men, starting from the same point, and attempting the same distance, with all the pedestrian's or the equestrian's toil and tardiness. The cotton mills of Massachusetts will turn out more cloth in one day than could have been manufactured by all the inhabitants of the Eastern continent during the tenth century. On an element which, in ancient times, was supposed to be exclusively within the control of the gods, and where it was deemed impious for human power to intrude, even there the gigantic forces of nature, which human science and skill have enlisted in their service, confront and overcome the raging of the elements, — breasting tempests and tides, escaping reefs and lee-shores, and careering triumphant around the globe. The velocity of winds, the weight of waters, and the rage of steam, are powers, each one of which is infinitely stronger than all the strength of all the nations and races of mankind, were it all gathered into a single arm. And all these energies are given us on one condition, — the condition of intelligence, — that is, of education.

Had God intended that the work of the world should be done by human bones and sinews, he would have given us an arm as solid and strong as the shaft of a steam-engine; and enabled us to stand, day and night, and turn the crank of a steamship while sailing to Liverpool or Calcutta. Had God designed the human muscles to do the work of the world, then, instead of the ingredients of gun-powder or gun-cotton, and the expansive force of heat, he would have given us hands which could take a granite quarry and break its solid acres into suitable and symmetrical blocks, as easily as we now open an orange. Had he intended us for bearing burdens, he would have given us Atlantean shoulders, by which we could carry the vast freights of rail-car and steamship, as a porter carries his pack. He would have given us lungs by which we could blow fleets before us; and wings to sweep over ocean wastes. But, instead of iron arms, and Atlantean shoulders, and the lungs of Boreas, he has given us a mind, a soul, a capacity of acquiring knowledge, and thus of appropriating all these energies of nature to our own use. Instead of a telescopic and microscopic eye, he has given us power to invent the telescope and the microscope. Instead of ten thousand fingers, he has given us genius inventive of the power-loom and the printing-press. Without a cultivated intellect, man is among the weakest of all the dynamical forces of nature; with a cultivated intellect, he commands them all.

And now, what does the slave-maker do? He abolishes this mighty power of the intellect, and uses only the weak, degraded, and half animated forces of the human limbs. A thousand slaves may stand by a river, and to them it is only an object of fear or of superstition. An educated man surpasses the ancient idea of a river-god; he stands by the Penobscot, the Kennebec, the Merrimack, or the Connecticut; he commands each of them to do more work than could be performed by a hundred thousand men, — to saw timber, to make cloth, to grind corn, — and they obey. Ignorant slaves stand upon a coal-mine, and to them it is only a worthless part of the inanimate earth. An educated man uses the same mine to print a million of books. Slaves will seek to obtain the same crop from the same field, year after year, though the *paludum* of that crop is exhausted; the educated man, with his chemist's eye, sees not only the minutest atoms of earth, but the imponderable gases that permeate it, and he is rewarded with an unbroken succession of luxuriant harvests.

Nor are these advantages confined to those departments of nature where her mightiest forces are brought into requisition. In accomplishing whatever requires delicacy and precision, nature is as much more perfect than man, as she is more powerful in whatever requires strength. Whether in great or in small operations, all the improvements in the mechanical and the useful arts come as directly from intelligence, as a bird comes out of a shell, or the beautiful colors of a flower out of sunshine. The slave-worker is forever prying

at the short end of Nature's lever, and using the back instead of the edge of her finest instruments.

Sir, the most abundant proof exists, derived from all departments of human industry, that uneducated labor is comparatively unprofitable labor. I have before me the statements of a number of the most intelligent gentlemen of Massachusetts, affirming this fact as the result of an experience extending over many years. In Massachusetts we have no native born child wholly without school instruction; but the degrees of attainment, of mental development, are various. Half a dozen years ago, the Massachusetts Board of Education obtained statements from large numbers of our master manufacturers, authenticated from the books of their respective establishments, and covering a series of years, the result of which was, that increased wages were found in connection with increased intelligence, just as certainly as increased heat raises the mercury in the thermometer. Foreigners, and those coming from other States, who made their marks when they receipted their bills, earned the least; those who had a moderate, or limited education, occupied a middle ground on the pay-roll; while the intelligent young women who worked in the mills in winter, and taught schools in summer, crowned the list. The larger capital, in the form of intelligence, yielded the larger interest in the form of wages. This inquiry was not confined to manufactures, but was extended to other departments of business, where the results of labor could be made the subject of exact measurement.

This is universally so. The mechanic sees it, when he compares the work of a stupid with that of an awakened mind. The traveller sees it, when he passes from an educated into an uneducated nation. Sir, there are countries in Europe, lying side by side, where, without compass or chart, without bound or landmark, I could run the line of demarcation between the two, by the broad, legible characters which ignorance has written on roads, fields, houses, and the persons of men, women, and children, on one side, and which knowledge has inscribed on the other.

This difference is most striking in the mechanic arts, but it is clearly visible also in husbandry. Not the most fertile soil, not mines of silver and gold, can make a nation rich, without intelligence. Who ever had a more fertile soil than the Egyptians? Who have handled more silver and gold than the Spaniards? The universal cultivation of the mind and heart is the only true source of opulence;—the cultivation of the mind, by which to lay hold on the treasures of nature; the cultivation of the heart, by which to devote those treasures to beneficent uses. Where this cultivation exists, no matter how barren the soil or ungenial the clime, there comfort and competence will abound; for it is the intellectual and moral condition of the cultivator that impoverishes the soil or makes it teem with abundance. He who disobeys the law of God in regard to the culture of the intellectual and spiritual nature, may live in the valley of the Nile, but he can rear only the "lean kine" of Pharaoh; but he who obeys the highest law may dwell in the cold and inhospitable regions of Scotland or of New England, and "well-formed and fat-fleshed kine" shall feed on all his meadows. If Pharaoh will be a taskmaster, and will not let the bondmen go free, the corn in his field shall be the "seven thin ears blasted by the east wind;" but if he will obey the commandments of the Lord, then behold there shall be "seven ears of corn upon one stalk, all rank and good." Sir, the sweat of a slave poisons the soil upon which it falls; his breath is mildew to every green thing; his tear withers the verdure it drops upon.

But slavery makes the general education of the whites impossible. You cannot have general education without Common Schools. Common Schools cannot exist where the population is sparse. Where slaves till the soil, or do the principal part of whatever work is done, the free population must be sparse. Slavery, then, by an inexorable law, denies general education to the whites. The Providence of God is just and retributive. Create a serf caste, and debar them from education, and you necessarily debar a great portion of the privileged class from education also. It is impossible, in the present state of things,

or in any state of things which can be foreseen, to have free and universal education in a slave state. The difficulty is insurmountable. For a well organized system of Common Schools, there should be two hundred children, at least, living in such proximity to each other that the oldest of them can come together to a central school. It is not enough to gather from within a circle of half a dozen miles' diameter fifty or sixty children for a single school. This brings all ages and all studies into the same room. A good system requires a separation of school children into four, or at least into three, classes, according to ages and attainments. Without this gradation, a school is bereft of more than half its efficiency. Now, this can never be done in an agricultural community where there are two classes of men,—one to do all the work, and the other to seize all the profits. With New England habits of industry, and with that diversified labor which would be sure to spring from intelligence, the State of Virginia, which skirts us here on the south, would support all the population of the New England States, and fill them with abundance.

Mr. BAYLY. We have as great a population as New England now.

Mr. MANN. As great a population as New England!!

Mr. BAYLY. We send fifteen representatives.

[A voice. And how many of them represent slaves?]

Mr. MANN. Massachusetts alone sends ten representatives.

[A voice. And the rest of New England twenty-one more.]

Mr. MANN. I say, sir, the single State of Virginia could support in abundance the whole population of New England. With such a free population, the school children would be so numerous that public schools might be opened within three or four miles of each other all over its territory,—the light of each of which, blending with its neighboring lights, would illumine the whole land. They would be schools, too, in point of cheapness, within every man's means. The degrading idea of pauper schools would be discarded forever. But what is the condition of Virginia now? One quarter part of all its adult free white population are unable to read or write, and were proclaimed to be so by a late Governor, in his annual message, without producing any reform. Their remedy is to choose a Governor who will not proclaim such a fact. When has Virginia, in any State or national election, given a majority equal to the number of its voters unable to read or write? A *Republican* government supported by the two pillars of Slavery and Ignorance!

In South Carolina there is also a fund for the support of pauper schools; but this had become so useless, and was so disdained by its objects, that a late Governor of the State, in his annual message, recommended that it should be withdrawn from them altogether.

Yet in many of the slave States there are beautiful paper systems of Common Schools,—dead laws in the statute-books,—and the census tells us how profitless they have been. In 1840, in the fifteen slave States and Territories, there were only 201,085 scholars at the primary schools. In the same class of schools in the free States, there were 1,626,028,—eight times as many. New York alone had 502,367, or two and a half times as many. The scholars in the primary schools of Ohio alone outnumbered all those in the fifteen slave States and Territories by more than 17,000. In the slave States, almost one tenth part of the free white population over twenty years of age are unable to read and write. In the free States, less than one in one hundred and fifty; and at least four fifths of these are foreigners, who ought not to be included in the computation. Many of the slave States, too, have magnificent school funds. Kentucky has one of more than a million of dollars; Tennessee of two millions; yet, in 1837, Governor Clarke, of Kentucky, declared, in his message to the Legislature, that “one third of the adult population were unable to write their names;” and in the State of Tennessee, according to the last census, there were 58,531 of the same description of persons. Surely it would take more than five of these to make three free-men; for the more a State has of them the less of intelligent freedom will there be in it. And if the schools in the slave States are compared with the

schools in the free States, the deficiency in quality will be as great as the deficiency in number.

Sir, during the last ten years I have had a most extensive correspondence with the intelligent friends of education in the slave States. They yearn for progress, but they cannot obtain it. They procure laws to be passed, but there is no one to execute them. They set forth the benefits and the blessings of education; but they speak in a vacuum, and no one hears the appeal. If a parent wishes to educate his children, he must send them from home, and thus suffer a sort of bereavement, even while they live; or he must employ a tutor or governess in his family, which few are able to do. The rich may do it, but what becomes of the children of the poor? In cities the obstacles are less; but the number of persons resident in cities is relatively small. All this is the inevitable consequence of slavery; and it is as impossible for free, thorough, universal education to coexist with slavery as for two bodies to occupy the same space at the same time. Slavery would abolish education, if it should invade a free State; education would abolish slavery, if it *could* invade a slave State.

Destroying common education, slavery destroys the fruits of common education,—the inventive mind, practical talent, the power of adapting means to ends in the business of life. Whence have come all those mechanical and scientific improvements and inventions which have enriched the world with so many comforts, and adorned it with so many beauties; which to-day give enjoyments and luxuries to a common family in a New England village, that neither Queen Elizabeth of England nor any of her proud court ever dreamed of, but a little more than two centuries ago? Among whom have these improvements originated? All history and experience affirm that they have come, and must come, from people among whom education is most generous and unconfined. Increase the *constituency*, if I may so speak, of developed intellect, and you increase in an equal ratio the chances of inventive, creative genius. From what part of our own country has come the application of steam to the propulsion of boats for commercial purposes, or of wheels for manufacturing purposes? Where have the various and almost infinite improvements been made which have resulted in the present perfection of cotton and woollen machinery? Whence came the invention of the cotton-gin, and the great improvements in railroads? Where was born the mighty genius who invented the first lightning-rod, which sends the electric fluid harmless into the earth; or that other genius, not less beneficent, who invented the second lightning-rod, which sends the same fluid from city to city on messages of business or of affection? Sir, these are results which you can no more have without common education, without inbuing the public mind with the elements of knowledge, than you can have corn without planting, or harvests without sunshine.

Look into the Patent Office reports, and see in what sections of country mechanical improvements and the application of science to the useful arts have originated. Out of *five hundred and seventy-two* patents issued in 1847, only *sixty-six* were to the slave States. The patents annually issued, it is true, are a mingled heap of chaff and wheat, but some of it is wheat worthy of Olympus. I think the Patent Office reports show, that at least six or eight times as many patents have been taken out for the North as for the South. What improvements will a slave ever make in agricultural implements; in the manufacture of metals; in preparing wool, cotton, silk, fur, or paper; in chemical processes; in the application of steam; in philosophical, nautical, or optical instruments; in civil engineering, architecture, the construction of roads, canals, wharves, bridges, docks, piers, &c.; in hydraulics or pneumatics; in the application of the mechanical powers; in household furniture, or wearing apparel; in printing, binding, engraving, &c., &c.? This question, when put in reference to slaves, appears ridiculous; and yet it is no more absurd, when asked in reference to an ignorant slave, than when asked in reference to an uneducated white man. The fact that the latter is a voter makes no difference, notwithstanding the common opinion, in certain latitudes, that it does.

All such improvements come from minds which have had an early awakening, and been put on scientific trains of thought in their childhood and youth, — a thing utterly impossible for the people at large, without Common Schools.

These are causes; now look at effects. In the New England States, the iron manufacture is twenty times as much, according to the population, as it is in Virginia; and yet Virginia has far more of the ore than they. In cotton, we can hardly find a fraction low enough to express the difference. The ship-building in Maine and Massachusetts is thirty-five times as much as in Virginia. The North comes to the South, cuts their timber, carries it home, manufactures it, and then brings it back wrought into a hundred different forms, to be sold to those who would see it rot before their eyes.

Can any man give a reason why Norfolk should not have grown like New York, other than the difference in the institutions of the people? Jamestown was settled before Plymouth, and had *natural* advantages superior to it. Plymouth now has a population of between seven and eight thousand, is worth two millions of dollars, and taxed itself last year, for schools and school-houses, more than seven thousand dollars. I ought rather to say, that it invested more than seven thousand dollars in a kind of stock that yields a hundred per cent. income. How many bats there may be in the ruins of Jamestown the last census does not inform us. The books printed at the South I suppose not to be equal to *one fiftieth* part of the number printed at the North. In maps, charts, engravings, and so forth, the elements of comparison exist only on one side.

Out of universal education come genius, skill, and enterprise, and the desire of bettering one's condition. Industry and frugality are their concomitants. Diversified labor secures a home market. Diligence earns much, but the absence of the vices of indolence saves more. Hence comforts abound, while capital accumulates. After the home consumption is supplied, there is a surplus for export. The balance of trade is favorable. All the higher institutions of learning and religion can be liberally supported. These institutions impart an elevated and moral tone to society. Hence efforts for all kinds of social ameliorations. Temperance societies spring up. Societies for preventing crime; for saving from pauperism; for the reform of prisons and the reformation of prisoners; for peace; for sending missionaries to the heathen; for diffusing the Gospel, — all these, where a sound education is given, grow up, in the order of Providence, as an oak grows out of an acorn.

In one thing the South has excelled, — in training statesmen. The primary and the ultimate effects of slavery upon this fact are so well set forth in a late sermon by Dr. Bushnell, of Hartford, Connecticut, that I will read a passage from it:

"And here, since this institution of slavery, entering into the fortunes of our history, complicates in so many ways the disorders we suffer, I must pause a few moments to sketch its characteristics. Slavery, it is not to be denied, is an essentially barbarous institution. It gives us, too, that sign which is the perpetual distinction of barbarism, that it has no law of progress. The highest level it reaches is the level at which it begins. Indeed, we need not scruple to allow that it has yielded us one considerable advantage, in virtue of the fact that it produces its best condition first. For while the northern people were generally delving in labor, for many generations, to create a condition of comfort, slavery set the masters at once on a footing of ease, gave them leisure for elegant intercourse, for unprofessional studies, and seasoned their character thus with that kind of cultivation which distinguishes men of society. A class of statesmen were thus raised up, who were prepared to figure as leaders in scenes of public life, where so much depends on manners and social address. But now the scale is changing. Free labor is rising, at length, into a state of wealth and comfort, to take the lead of American society. Meanwhile, the foster sons of slavery, — the high families, the statesmen, — gradually receding in character, as they must under this vicious institution, are receding also in power and influence, and have been ever since the Revolution. Slavery is a condition against nature; the curse of nature, therefore, is on it, and it bows to its doom by a law as irresistible as gravity. It produces a condition of ease which is not the reward of labor, and a state of degradation which is not the curse of idleness. Therefore, the ease it enjoys cannot but end in a curse, and the degradation it suffers cannot rise into a blessing. It nourishes imperious and violent passions. It makes the masters solitary sheiks on their estates, forbidding thus the possibility of public schools, and preventing also that condensed form of society which is necessary to the vigorous maintenance of churches. Education and religion thus displaced, the dinner-table only remains, and on this hangs, in great part, the keeping of the social state. But however highly we may estimate the humanizing power of hospitality, it cannot be regarded as any sufficient spring of character. It is neither a school nor a gospel. And when it comes of self-indulgence, or only seeks relief for the tedium of an idle life, scarcely does it bring with it the blessings of a virtue. The accomplishments it yields are of a

mock quality, rather than of a real, having about the same relation to a substantial and finished culture that honor has to character. This kind of currency will pass no longer; for, it is not expense without comfort, or splendor set in disorder, as diamonds in pewter; it is not air in place of elegance, or assurance substituted for ease; neither is it to be master of a fluent speech, or to garnish the same with stale quotations from the classics; much less is it to live in the *Don Juan* vein, accepting barbarism by poetic inspiration, — the same by which a late noble poet, drawing out of Turks and pirates, became the chosen laureate of slavery, — not any or all of these can make up such a style of man, or of life, as we in this age demand. We have come up now to a point where we look for true intellectual refinement, and a ripe state of personal culture. But how clearly is it seen to be a violation of its own laws, for slavery to produce a genuine scholar, or a man who, in any department of excellence, unless it be in politics, is not a full century behind his time! And if we ask for what is dearer and better still, for a pure Christian morality, the youth of slavery are trained in no such habits as are most congenial to virtue. The point of honor is the only principle many of them know. Violence and dissipation bring down every succeeding generation to a state continually lower; so that now, after a hundred and fifty years are passed, the slaveholding territory may be described as a vast missionary ground, and one so uncomfortable to the faithful ministry of Christ, by reason of its jealous tempers, and the known repugnance it has to many of the first maxims of the Gospel, that scarcely a missionary can be found to enter it. Connected with this moral decay, the resources of nature also are exhausted, and her fertile territories changed to a desert, by the increasing power of a spendthrift institution. And then, having made a waste where God had made a garden, slavery gathers up the relics of bankruptcy, and the baser relics still of virtue and all manly enterprise, and goes forth to renew, on a virgin soil, its dismal and forlorn history. Thus, at length, has been produced what may be called the bowie-knife style of civilization, and the new west of the South is overrun by it, — a spirit of blood which defies all laws of God and man; — honorable, but not honest; prompt to resent an injury, slack to discharge a debt; educated to ease, and readier, of course, when the means of living fail, to find them at the gambling-table or the race-ground, than in any work of industry, — probably squandering the means of living there, to relieve the tedium of ease itself."

The free schools of the North lead to the common diffusion of knowledge, and the equalization of society. The private schools of the South divide men into patricians and plebeians, so that, in the latter, a nuisance grows out of education itself. In the public schools of New York there are libraries now amounting to more than a million of volumes. In the schools of Massachusetts the number of volumes is relatively less, but the quality is greatly superior. In each of these States, within half an hour's walk of the poorest farm-house or mechanic's shop, there is a library, free and open to every child, containing works of history, biography, travels, ethics, natural science, &c., &c., which will supply him with the noblest capital of intelligence, wherewith to commence the business of making himself a useful and intelligent citizen. With the exception of New Orleans, (whose free schools were commenced and have been presided over by a Massachusetts man,) and three or four other cities, all the libraries in the public schools of the slave States could be carried in a schoolboy's satchel. The libraries of all the universities and colleges of the South contain 223,416 volumes; those of the North 593,897 volumes. The libraries of southern theological schools 22,800; those of northern 102,080.

Look into Silliman's Journal, or the volumes of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and inquire whence the communications came. Where live the historians of the country. Sparks, Prescott, Bancroft; the poets, Whittier, Bryant, Longfellow, Lowell; the jurists, Story, Kent, Wheaton; the classic models of writing, Channing, Everett, Irving; the female writers, Miss Sedgwick, Mrs. Sigourney, and Mrs. Child? All this proceeds from no superiority of natural endowment on the one side, or inferiority on the other. The Southern States are all within what may be called "the latitudes of genius;" for there is a small belt around the globe, comprising but a few degrees of latitude, which has produced all the distinguished men who have ever lived. I say this difference results from no difference in natural endowment. The mental endowments at the South are equal to those in any part of the world. But it comes because, in one quarter, the common atmosphere is vivified with knowledge, electric with ideas, while slavery gathers in Broctian fogs over the other. What West Point has been to our armies in Mexico, that, and more than that, good schools would be to the intelligence and industrial prosperity of our country.

It may seem a little out of place, but I cannot forbear here adverting to one point, which, as a lover of children and a parent, touches me more deeply than any other. To whom are intrusted, at the South, the early care and nurture of children? It has been thought by many educators and metaphysicians, that children learn as much before the age of seven years as ever

afterwards. Who, at the South, administers this early knowledge,—these ideas, these views, that have such sovereign efficacy in the formation of adult character? Who has the custody of children during this ductile, forming, receptive period of life,—a period when the mind absorbs whatever is brought into contact with it? Sir, the children of the South, more or less, and generally *more*, are tended and nurtured by slaves. Ignorance, superstition, vulgarity, passion, and perhaps impurity, are the breasts at which they nurse. Whatever other afflictions God may see fit to bring upon me, whatever other mercies He may withhold, may He give me none but persons of intelligence, of refinement, and of moral excellence, to walk with my children during the imitative years of their existence, and to lead them in the paths of knowledge, and breathe into their hearts the breath of a moral and religious life.

Before considering the moral character of slavery, I wish to advert for a moment to the position which we occupy as one of the nations of the earth, in this advancing period of the world's civilization. Nations, like individuals, have a character. The date of the latter is counted by years; that of the former by centuries. No man can have any self-respect who is not solicitous about his posthumous reputation. No man can be a patriot who feels neither joy nor shame at the idea of the honor or the infamy which his age and his country shall leave behind them. Nations, like individuals, have characteristic objects of ambition. Greece coveted the arts; Rome gloried in war; but liberty has been the goddess of our idolatry. Amid the storms of freedom were we cradled; in the struggles of freedom have our joints been knit; on the rich aliment of freedom have we grown to our present stature. With a somewhat too boastful spirit, perhaps, have we challenged the admiration of the world for our devotion to liberty; but an enthusiasm for the rights of man is so holy a passion, that even its excesses are not devoid of the beautiful. We have not only won freedom for ourselves, but we have taught its sacred lessons to others. The shout of "Death to tyrants, and freedom for man!" which pealed through this country seventy years ago, has at length reached across the Atlantic; and whoever has given an attentive ear to the sounds which have come back to us, within the last few months, from the European world, cannot have failed to perceive that they were only the far-travelled echoes of the American Declaration of Independence. But in the divine face of our liberty there has been one foul, demoniac feature. Whenever her votaries would approach her to worship, they have been fain to draw a veil over one part of her visage to conceal its hideousness. Whence came this deformity on her otherwise fair and celestial countenance? Sad is the story, but it must be told. Her mother was a vampire. As the daughter lay helpless in her arms, the beldam tore open her living flesh, and feasted upon her life-blood. Hence this unsightly wound, that affrights whoever beholds it. But, sir, I must leave dallying with these ambiguous metaphors. One wants the plain, sinewy, Saxon tongue, to tell of deeds that should have shamed devils. Great Britain was the mother. Her American colonies were the daughter. The mother lusted for gold. To get it, she made partnership with robbery and death. Shackles, chains, and weapons for human butchery, were her outfit in trade. She made Africa her hunting-ground. She made its people her prey, and the unwilling colonies her market-place. She broke into the Ethiop's home, as a wolf into a sheepfold at midnight. She set the continent a-flame, that she might seize the affrighted inhabitants as they ran shrieking from their blazing hamlets. The aged and the infant she left for the vultures; but the strong men and the strong women she drove, scourged and bleeding, to the shore. Packed and stowed like merchandize between unventilated decks, so close that the tempest without could not ruffle the pestilential air within, the voyage was begun. Once a day the hatches were opened, to receive food and to disgorge the dead. Thousands and thousands of corpses, which she plunged into the ocean from the decks of her slave-ships, she counted only as the tare of commerce. The blue monsters of the deep became familiar with her pathway; and, not more remorseless than she, they shared her plunder. At length the accursed vessel reached

the foreign shore. And there, monsters of the land, fiercer and feller than any that roam the watery plains, rewarded the robber by purchasing his spoils.

For more than a century did the madness of this traffic rage. During all these years, the clock of eternity never counted out a minute that did not witness the cruel death, by treachery or violence, of some son or daughter, some father or mother, of Africa. The three millions of slaves that now darken our southern horizon are the progeny of these progenitors,—a doomed race, fated and suffering from sire to son. But the enormities of the mother country did not pass without remonstrance. Many of the colonies expostulated against, and rebuked them. The New England colonies, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, presented to the throne the most humble and suppliant petitions, praying for the abolition of the trade. The colonial legislatures passed laws against it. But their petitions were spurned from the throne. Their laws were vetoed by the governors. In informal negotiations, attempted with the ministers of the crown, the friends of the slave were made to understand that royalty turned an adder's ear to their prayers. The profoundest feelings of lamentation and abhorrence were kindled in the bosoms of his western subjects by this flagitious conduct of the king. In that dark catalogue of crimes, which led our fathers to forswear allegiance to the British throne, its refusal to prohibit the slave trade to the colonies is made one of the most prominent of those political offences which are said to "define a tyrant." In the original draught of the Declaration of Independence, as prepared by Mr. Jefferson, this crime of King George the Third is set forth in the following words:

"He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piteous warfare, the opprobrium of infidel powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN King of Great Britain. Determined to keep a market where MEN should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce."

Now, if the king of Great Britain prostituted his negative that slavery might not be restricted, what, in after times, shall be said of those who prostitute their affirmative, that it may be extended? Yet it is now proposed, in some of the state legislatures, and in this capitol, to do precisely the same thing in regard to the Territory of Oregon, which was done by Great Britain to her transatlantic possessions; not merely to legalize slavery there, but to prohibit its inhabitants from prohibiting *it*. Though three thousand miles west of Great Britain, she had certain constitutional rights over us, and could affect our destiny. Though the inhabitants of Oregon are three thousand miles west of us, yet we have certain constitutional rights over them, and can affect their destiny. Great Britain annulled our laws for prohibiting slavery; we propose to annul an existing law of Oregon prohibiting slavery. If the execrations of mankind are yet too feeble and too few to punish Great Britain for her wickedness, what scope, what fulness, what eternity of execration and anathema, will be a sufficient retribution upon us, if we volunteer to copy her example? It was in the eighteenth century, when the mother country thus made merchandise of human beings,—a time when liberty was a forbidden word in the languages of Europe. It is in the nineteenth century, that we propose to reëdict, and on an ampler scale, the same execrable villany,—a time when liberty is the rallying cry of all Christendom. So great has been the progress of liberal ideas within the last century, that what was venial at its beginning is unpardonable at its close. To drive coffles of slaves from here to Oregon, in the middle of the nineteenth century, is more infamous than it was to bring cargoes of slaves from Africa here, in the middle of the eighteenth. Yet such is the period that men would select to perpetuate and increase the horrors of this traffic.

Sir, how often, on this floor, have indignant remonstrances been addressed to the North, for agitating the subject of slavery? How often have we at the North been told that we were inciting insurrection, fomenting a servile war, putting the black man's knife to the white man's throat. The air of this hall has been filled, its walls have been as it were sculptured, by southern eloquence, with images of devastated towns, of murdered men and

women; and, as a defence against the iniquities of the institution, they have universally put in the plea that the calamity was entailed upon them by the mother country, that it made a part of the world they were born into, and therefore they could not help it. I have always been disposed to allow its full weight to this palliation. But if they now insist upon perpetrating against the whole western world, which happens at present to be under our control, the same wrongs which, in darker days, Great Britain perpetrated against them, they will forfeit every claim to sympathy. Sir, here is a test. Let not southern men, who would now force slavery upon new regions, ever deny that their slavery at home is a chosen, voluntary, beloved crime.

But let us look, sir, at the moral character of slavery. It is proposed not merely to continue this institution where it now exists, but to extend it to the Pacific Ocean,—to spread it over the vast slopes of the Rocky Mountains. Sir, the conduct of governments, like the conduct of individuals, is subject to the laws and the retributions of Providence. If, therefore, there is any ingredient of wrong in this institution, we ought not to adopt it, or to permit it, even though it should pour wealth in golden showers over the whole surface of the land. In speaking of the moral character of slavery, sir, I mean to utter no word for the purpose of wounding the feelings of any man. On the other hand, I mean not to wound the cause of truth by abstaining from the utterance of any word which I ought to speak.

The institution of slavery is against natural right. Jurists, from the time of Justinian; orators, from the time of Cicero; poets, from the time of Homer, declare it to be wrong. The writers on moral or ethical science,—the expounders of the law of nations and of God,—denounce slavery as an invasion of the rights of man. They find no warrant for it in the eternal principles of justice and equity; and in that great division which they set forth between right and wrong, they arrange slavery in the catalogue of Crime! All the noblest instincts of human nature rebel against it. Whatever has been taught by sage, or sung by poet, in favor of freedom, is a virtual condemnation of slavery. Whenever we applaud the great champions of liberty, who, by the sacrifice of life in the cause of freedom, have won the homage of the world and an immortality of fame, we record the testimony of our hearts against slavery. Wherever patriotism and philanthropy have glowed brightest; wherever piety and a devout religious sentiment have burned most fervently, there has been the most decided recognition of the universal rights of man.

Sir, let us analyze this subject, and see if slavery be not the most compact, and concentrated, and condensed system of wrong which the depravity of man has ever invented. Slavery is said to have had its origin in war. It is claimed that the captor had a right to take the life of his captive; and that if he spared that life he made it his own, and thus acquired a right to control it. I deny the right of the captor to the life of his captive; and even if this right were conceded, I deny his right to the life of the captive's offspring. But this relation between captor and captive precludes the idea of peace; for no peace can be made where there is no free agency. Peace being precluded, it follows inevitably that the state of war continues. Hence, the state of slavery is a state of war; and though active hostilities may have ceased, they are liable to break out, and may rightfully break out, at any moment. How long must our fellow-citizens, who were enslaved in Algiers, have continued in slavery, before they would have lost the right of escape or of resistance?

The gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. Boccock,] in his speech this morning, put the right of the slaveholder upon a somewhat different ground. He said a man might acquire property in a horse before the existence of civil society, by catching a wild one. And so, he added, one man might acquire property in another man, by subduing him to his will. The superior force gave the right, whether to the horse or to the man. Now, if this be so, and if at any time the superior force should change sides, then it follows inevitably that the relation of the parties might be rightfully changed by a new appeal to force.

The same gentleman claims Bible authority for slavery. He says: "I see slavery there tolerated, I had almost said inculcated. I see such language as

this, 'Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall you buy bondmen and bondmaids; and ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession,' &c. Does not the gentleman know, that by the same authority, the Israelitish slaves were commanded to despoil their Egyptian masters, and to escape from bondage? Surely the latter is as good an authority as the former. If the gentleman's argument is sound, he is bound to advocate a repeal of the act of 1793. If the gentleman's argument is sound, the free States, instead of surrendering fugitive slaves to their masters, are bound to give those masters a Red-sea reception and embrace; and the escape of the children of Israel into Canaan is a direct precedent for the underground rail-road to Canada.

Both the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. FRENCH,] yesterday, and the gentleman from Virginia, to-day, spoke repeatedly, and without the slightest discrimination, of a "a slave and a horse," "a slave and a mule," &c. What should we think, sir, of a teacher for our children, or even of a tender of our cattle, who did not recognize the difference between men and mules,—between humanity and horse-flesh? What should we think, if, on opening a work, claiming to be a scientific treatise on zoölogy, we should find the author to be ignorant of the difference between biped and quadruped, or between men and birds, or men and fishes? Yet such errors would be trifling compared with those which have been made through all this debate. They would be simple errors in natural history, perhaps harmless; but these are errors,—fatal errors,—in humanity and Christian ethics. No, sir; all the legislation of the slave States proves that they do not treat, and cannot treat, a human being as an animal. I will show that they are ever trying to degrade him into an animal, although they can never succeed.

This conscious idea that the state of slavery is a state of war,—a state in which superior force keeps inferior force down,—develops and manifests itself perpetually. It exhibits itself in the statute-books of the slave States, prohibiting the education of slaves, making it highly penal to teach them so much as the alphabet; dispersing and punishing all meetings where they come together in quest of knowledge. Look into the statute-books of the free States, and you will find law after law, encouragement after encouragement, to secure the diffusion of knowledge. Look into the statute-books of the slave States, and you find law after law, penalty after penalty, to secure the extinction of knowledge. Who has not read with delight those books which have been written, both in England and in this country, entitled "*The Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties*," giving the biographies of illustrious men, who, by an undaunted and indomitable spirit, had risen from poverty and obscurity to the heights of eminence, and blessed the world with their achievements in literature, in science, and in morals? Yet here, in what we call republican America, are fifteen great States, vying with each other to see which will bring the blackest and most impervious pall of ignorance over three millions of human beings; nay, which can do most to stretch this pall across the continent, from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Is not knowledge a good? Is it not one of the most precious bounties which the all-bountiful Giver has bestowed upon the human race? Sir John Herschel, possessed of ample wealth, his capacious mind stored with the treasures of knowledge, surrounded by the most learned society in the most cultivated metropolis in the world, says: "If I were to pray for a taste which should stand me in stead, under every variety of circumstances, and be a source of happiness and cheerfulness to me through life, and a shield against its ills, however things might go amiss, and the world frown upon me, it would be a taste for reading." Yet it is now proposed to colonize the broad regions of the West with millions of our fellow-beings, who shall never be able to read a book, or write a word; to whom knowledge shall bring no delight in childhood, no relief in the weary hours of sickness or convalescence, no solace in the decrepitude of age; who shall perceive nothing of the beauties of art, who shall know nothing of the wonders of science, who shall never reach any lofty, intellectual conception of the attributes of their great Creator;—deaf to all the

hosannas of praise which nature sings to her Maker; blind in this magnificent temple which God has builded.

Sir, it is one of the noblest attributes of man that he can derive knowledge from his predecessors. We possess the accumulated learning of ages. From ten thousand confluent streams, the river of truth, widened and deepened, has come down to us; and it is among our choicest delights, that if we can add to its volume, as it rolls on, it will bear a richer freight of blessings to our successors. But it is here proposed to annul this beneficent law of nature; to repel this proffered bounty of Heaven. It is proposed to create a race of men, to whom all the lights of experience shall be extinguished; whose hundredth generation shall be as ignorant and as barbarous as its first.

Sir, I hold all voluntary ignorance to be a crime; I hold all enforced ignorance to be a greater crime. Knowledge is essential to all rational enjoyment; it is essential to the full and adequate performance of every duty. Whoever intercepts knowledge, therefore, on its passage to a human soul; whoever strikes down the hand that is outstretched to grasp it, is guilty of one of the most heinous of offences. Add to your virtue, knowledge, says the Apostle; but here the command is, be-cloud and be-little by ignorance, whatever virtue you may possess.

Sir, let me justify the earnestness of these expressions, by describing the transition of feeling through which I have lately passed. I come from a community where knowledge ranks next to virtue, in the classification of blessings. On the tenth day of April last, the day before I left home for this place, I attended the dedication of a schoolhouse in Boston, which had cost \$70,000. The mayor presided, and much of the intelligence and worth of the city was present on the occasion. I see by a paper which I have this day received, that another schoolhouse, in the same city, was dedicated on Monday of the present week. It was there stated by the mayor, that the cost of the city schoolhouses which had been completed within the last three months, was \$200,000. On Tuesday of this week, a new high schoolhouse in the city of Cambridge was dedicated. Mr. Everett, the President of Harvard College, was present, and addressed the assembly in a long, and, I need not add, a most beautiful speech. That schoolhouse, with two others to be dedicated within a week, will have cost \$25,000. Last week, in the neighboring city of Charlestown, a new high schoolhouse, of a most splendid and costly character, was dedicated by the mayor and city government, by clergy and laity. But it is not mayors of cities, and presidents of colleges alone, that engage in the work of consecrating temples of education to the service of the young. Since I have been here, the Governor of the Commonwealth, Mr. Briggs, went to Newburyport, a distance of forty miles, to attend the dedication of a schoolhouse, which cost \$25,000. On a late occasion, when the same excellent chief magistrate travelled forty miles to attend the dedication of a schoolhouse in the country, some speaker congratulated the audience because the governor of the commonwealth had come down from the executive chair to honor the occasion. "No," said he, "I have come up to the occasion to be honored by it." Within the last year, \$200,000 have been given by individuals to Harvard College. Within a little longer time than this, the other two colleges in the State have received, together, a still larger endowment, from individuals or the State.

These measures are part of a great system which we are carrying on for the elevation of the race. Last year, the voters of Massachusetts, in their respective towns, voluntarily taxed themselves about a million of dollars for the support of Common Schools. We have an old law on the statute-book, requiring towns to tax themselves for the support of public schools; but the people have long since lost sight of this law in the munificence of their contributions. Massachusetts is now erecting a reform school for vagrant and exposed children, — so many of whom come to us from abroad, — which will cost the State more than a hundred thousand dollars. An unknown individual has given twenty thousand dollars towards it. We educate all our deaf and dumb and blind. An appropriation was made by the last Legislature to establish a school for idiots, in imitation of those beautiful institutions in Paris, in Switzerland,

and in Berlin, where the most revolting and malicious of this deplorable class are tamed into docility, made lovers of order and neatness, and capable of performing many valuable services. The future teacher of this school is now abroad, preparing himself for his work. A few years ago, Mr. Everett, the present President of Harvard College, then Governor of the Commonwealth, spoke the deep *convictions* of Massachusetts people, when, in a public address on Education, he exhorted the fathers and mothers of Massachusetts in the following words: "Save," said he, "save, spare, scrape, stint, starve, do anything but steal," to educate your children. And Doctor Howe, the noble-hearted director of the Institution for the Blind, lately uttered the deepest *sentiments* of our citizens, when, in speaking of our duties to the blind, the deaf and dumb, and the idiotic, he said: "The sight of any human being left to brutish ignorance is always demoralizing to the beholders. There floats not upon the stream of life a wreck of humanity so utterly shattered and crippled, but that its signals of distress should challenge attention and command assistance."

Sir, it was all glowing and fervid with sentiments like these, that, a few weeks ago, I entered this House,—sentiments transfused into my soul from without, even if I had no vital spark of nobleness to kindle them within. Imagine, then, my strong revulsion of feeling, when the first set, elaborate speech which I heard, was that of the gentleman from Virginia, proposing to extend ignorance to the uttermost bounds of this Republic,—to legalize it, to enforce it, to necessitate it, and make it eternal. Since him, many others have advocated the same abhorrent doctrine. Not satisfied with dooming a whole race of our fellow-beings to mental darkness, impervious and everlasting,—not satisfied with drawing this black curtain of ignorance between man and nature, between the human soul and its God, from the Atlantic to the Rio Grande, across half the continent,—they desire to increase this race ten, twenty millions more, and to unfold and spread out this black curtain across the other half of the continent. When, sir, in the halls of legislation, men advocate measures like this, it is no figure of speech to say, that their words are the clankings of multitudinous fetters; each gesture of their arms tears human flesh with ten thousand whips; each exhalation of their breath spreads clouds of moral darkness from horizon to horizon.

Twenty years ago, a sharp sensation ran through the nerves of the civilized world, at the story of a young man named Caspar Hauser, found in the city of Nuremberg, in Bavaria. Though sixteen or seventeen years of age, he could not walk nor talk. He heard without understanding; he saw without perceiving; he moved without definite purpose. It was the soul of an infant in the body of an adult. After he had learned to speak, he related that, from his earliest recollection, he had always been kept in a hole so small, that he could not stretch out his limbs, where he saw no light, heard no sound, nor even witnessed the face of the attendant who brought him his scanty food. For many years conjecture was rife concerning his history, and all Germany was searched to discover his origin. After a long period of fruitless inquiry and speculation, public opinion settled down into the belief that he was the victim of some great unnatural crime; that he was the heir to some throne, and had been sequestered by ambition; or the inheritor of vast wealth, and had been hidden away by cupidity; or the offspring of criminal indulgence, and had been buried alive to avoid exposure and shame. A German, Von Feuerbach, published an account of Caspar, entitled "*The Example of a Crime on the Life of the Soul.*" But why go to Europe to be thrilled with the pathos of a human being shrouded from the light of nature, and cut off from a knowledge of duty and of God? To-day, in this boasted land of light and liberty, there are three million Caspar Hausers; and, as if this were not enough, it is proposed to multiply their number tenfold, and to fill up all the western world with these proofs of human avarice and guilt. It is proposed that we ourselves should create, and should publish to the world, not one, but untold millions of "*Examples of a Crime on the Life of the Soul.*" It is proposed that the self-styled freemen, the self-styled Christians, of fifteen great states in this American Union, shall engage in the work of procreating, rearing, and *selling*

Caspar Hausers, often from their own loins; and if any further development of soul or of body is allowed to the American victims than was permitted to the Bavarian child, it is only because such development will increase their market value at the barracoons. It is not from any difference of motive, but only the better to insure that motive's indulgence. The slave child must be allowed to use his limbs, or how could he drudge out his life in the service of his master? The slave infant must be taught to walk, or how, *under the shadow of this thrice glorious Capitol*, could he join a coffin for New Orleans?

I know, sir, that it has been said, within a short time past, that Caspar Hauser was an impostor, and his story a fiction. Would to God that this could ever be said of his fellow-victims in America!

For another reason slavery is an unspeakable wrong. The slave is debarred from testifying against a white man. The courts will not hear him as a witness. By the principles of the common law, if any man suffers violence at the hands of another, he can prefer his complaint to magistrates, or to the grand juries of the courts, who are bound to give him redress. Hence the law is said to hold up its shield before every man for his protection. It surrounds him in the crowded street and in the solitary place. It guards his treasures with greater vigilance than locks or iron safes; and against meditated aggressions upon himself, his wife or his children, it fastens his doors every night, more securely than triple bolts of brass. But all these sacred protections are denied to the slave. While subjected to the law of force, he is shut out from the law of right. To suffer injury is his, but never to obtain redress. For personal cruelties, for stripes that shiver his flesh, and blows that break his bones, for robbery or for murder, neither he nor his friends can have preventive, remedy or recompense. The father, who is a slave, may see son or daughter scored, mangled, mutilated or ravished before his eyes, and he must be dumb as a sheep before its shearers. The wife may be dishonored in the presence of the husband, and, if he remonstrates or rebels, the miscreant who could burn with the lust, will burn not less fiercely with a vengeance to be glutted upon his foiler.

Suppose, suddenly, by some disastrous change in the order of nature, an entire kingdom or community were to be enveloped in total darkness,—to have no day, no dawn, but midnight evermore! Into what infinite forms of violence and wrong would the depraved passions of the human heart spring up, when no longer restrained by the light of day, and the dangers of exposure! So far as legal rights against his oppressors are concerned, the slave lives in such a world of darkness. A hundred of his fellows may stand around him and witness the wrongs he suffers, but not one of them can appeal to jury, magistrate, or judge, for punishment or redress. The wickedest white man, in a company of slaves, bears a charmed life. There is not one of the fell passions that rages in his bosom which he cannot indulge with wantonness, and to satiety, and the court has no ears to hear the complaint of the victim. How dearly does every honorable man prize character! The law denies the slave a character: for, however traduced, legal vindication is impossible.

And yet, infinitely flagrant as the anomaly is, the slave is amenable to the laws of the land for all offences which he may commit against others, though he is powerless to protect himself by the same law from offences which others may commit against him. He may suffer all wrong, and the courts will not hearken to his testimony; but for the first wrong he does, the same courts inflict their severest punishments upon him. This is the reciprocity of slave law,—to be forever liable to be proved guilty, but never able to prove himself innocent; to be subject to all punishments, but through his own oath, to no protection. Hear what is said by the highest judicial tribunal of South Carolina: "Although slaves are held to be the absolute property of their owners, yet they have the power of committing crimes."—*2d Nott and McCord's Rep.*, p. 179. A negro is so far amenable to the common law, that he may be one of three to constitute the number necessary to make a riot.—

1st Bay's Rep., 358. By the laws of the same State, a negro may be himself stolen and he has no redress; but if he steals a negro from another, he shall be hung. — *2d Nott and McCord's Rep.*, 179. [*An example of this penalty suffered by a slave.*] This is the way that slave legislatures and slave judicatories construe the command of Christ, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also the same unto them." Nay, by the laws of some of the slave States, where master and slave are engaged in a joint act, the slave is indictable, while the master is not.

What rights are more sacred or more dear to us than the conjugal and the parental? No savage nation, however far removed from the frontiers of civilization, has ever yet been discovered, where these rights were unknown or unhonored. The beasts of the forest feel and respect them. It is only in the land of slaves that they are blotted out and annihilated.

Slavery is an unspeakable wrong to the conscience. The word "conscience" conveys a complex idea. It includes conscientiousness; that is, the sentiment or instinct of right and wrong; and also intelligence, which is the guide of this sentiment. *Conscience*, then, implies both the desire or impulse to do right, and also a knowledge of what is right. Nature endows us with the sentiment, but the knowledge we must acquire. Hence we speak of an "enlightened conscience," meaning thereby not only the moral sense, but that knowledge of circumstances, relations, tendencies and results, which is necessary in order to guide the moral sense to just conclusions. Each of these elements is equally necessary to enable a man to feel right and to act right. Mere knowledge, without the moral sense, can take no cognizance of the everlasting distinctions between right and wrong, and so the blind instinct, unguided by knowledge, will be forever at fault in its conclusions. The two were made to coëxist and operate together, by Him who made the human soul. But the impious hand of man divorces these twin-capacities, wherever it denies knowledge. If one of these coördinate powers in the mental realm be annulled by the Legislature, it may be called law; but it is repugnant to every law and attribute of God.

But, not satisfied with having invaded the human soul, and annihilated one of its most sacred attributes, in the persons of three millions of our fellow-men; not satisfied with having killed the conscience, as far as it can be killed by human device, and human force, in an entire race; we are now invoked to multiply that race, to extend it over regions yet unscathed by its existence, and there to call into being other millions of men, upon whose souls, and upon the souls of whose posterity, the same unholy spoliation shall be committed forever.

Slavery is an unspeakable wrong to the religious nature of man. The dearest and most precious of all human rights is the right of private judgment in matters of religion. I am interested in nothing else so much as in the attributes of my Creator, and in the relations which he has established between me and Himself, for time and for eternity. To investigate for myself these relations, and their momentous consequences; to "search the Scriptures;" to explore the works of God in the outward and visible universe; to ask counsel of the sages and divines of the ages gone by, — these are rights which it would be sacrilege in me to surrender; which it is worse sacrilege in any human being or human government to usurp. Yet, by denying education to the slave, you destroy not merely the *right* but the *power* of personal examination in regard to all that most nearly concerns the soul's interests. Who so base as not to reverence the mighty champions of religious freedom, in days when the dungeon, the rack, and the fagot, were the arguments of a government theology? Who does not reverence, I say, Wickliffe, Huss, Luther, and the whole army of martyrs whose blood reddened the axe of English intolerance? Yet it was only for this right of private judgment; for this independence of another man's control, in religious concerns, that the godlike champions of religious liberty perilled themselves and perished. Yet it is this very religious despotism over millions of men, which it is now proposed, not to destroy, but to create. It is proposed not to break old fetters and cast them

away, but to forge new ones and rivet them on. Sir, on the continent of Europe, and in the Tower of London, I have seen the axes, the chains, and other horrid implements of death, by which the great defenders of freedom for the soul were brought to their final doom, — by which political and religious liberty was cloven down; but fairer and lovelier to the view were axe and chain, and all the ghastly implements of death ever invented by religious bigotry or civil despotism to wring and torture freedom out of the soul of man; — fairer and lovelier were they all than the parchment roll of this House on which shall be inscribed a law for profaning one additional foot of American soil with the curse of slavery. [Here the chairman's hammer announced the close of the hour. Mr. MANN had but one topic more which he designed to elucidate, — the inevitable tendency of slavery to debase the standard both of private and of public morals in any community where it exists.]

After the above speech was delivered, I was referred to a Tract, written by a Virginian, on the subject of slavery; and, by the politeness of its author, I have since obtained a copy of it. It is entitled, "*Address to the People of West Virginia; showing that slavery is injurious to the public welfare, and that it may be gradually abolished, without detriment to the rights and interests of slaveholders.* By A SLAVEHOLDER OF WEST VIRGINIA. Lexington: R. C. Noel. 1847." This Address was written by the Rev. Henry Ruffner, D. D., President of Lexington College, Lexington, Va. Some of the passages of this Address are so striking; it is throughout so corroborative of one of the arguments contained in the Speech; and, coming as it does, from a Virginian, an eye-witness of the effects of slavery, and a holder of slaves, that I have thought it would be useful to append them to this *revised and corrected* edition of the Speech. The extracts, of course, are not, as here, consecutive.

H. M.

West Newton, Sept. 1, 1848.

"Nowhere, since time began, have the two systems of slave labor and free labor been subjected to so fair and so decisive a trial of their effects on public prosperity, as in these United States. Here the two systems have worked side by side for ages, under such equal circumstances, both political and physical, and with such ample time and opportunity for each to work out its proper effects, that all must admit the experiment to be now complete, and the result decisive. No man of common sense, who has observed this result, can doubt for a moment, that the system of free labor promotes the growth and prosperity of States in a much higher degree than the system of slave labor. In the first settlement of a country, when labor is scarce and dear, slavery may give a temporary impulse to improvement; but even this is not the case, except in warm climates, and where free men are scarce and either sickly or lazy; and when we have said this, we have said all that experience in the United States warrants us to say, in favor of the policy of employing slave labor.

It is the common remark of all who have travelled through the United States, that the free States and the slave States exhibit a striking contrast in their appearance. In the older free States are seen all the tokens of prosperity; — a dense and increasing population; thriving villages, towns and cities; a neat and productive agriculture, growing manufactures, and active commerce.

In the older parts of the slave States, — with a few local exceptions, — are seen, on the contrary, too evident signs of stagnation, or of positive decay; — a sparse population, a slovenly cultivation spread over vast fields that are wearing out, among others already worn out and desolate; villages and towns, "few and far between," rarely growing, often decaying, sometimes mere remnants of what they were, sometimes deserted ruins, haunted only by owls; generally no manufactures, nor even trades, except the indispensable few; commerce and navigation abandoned, as far as possible, to the people of the free States; and generally, instead of the stir and bustle of industry, a dull and dreamy stillness, broken, if broken at all, only by the woeful brawl of politics.

New England and the middle States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, contained in 1790, 1,968,000 inhabitants, and in 1840, 6,760,000; having gained, in this period, 243 per cent.

The four old slave States had in 1790 a population of 1,473,000, and in 1840, of 3,279,000; having gained, in the same period, 122 per cent., just about half as much, in proportion, as the free States. They ought to have gained about twice as much; for they had at first only seven inhabitants to the square mile, when the free States not only had upwards of twelve, but, on the whole, much inferior advantages of soil and climate. Even cold, barren New England, though more than twice as thickly peopled, grew in population at a faster rate than these old slave States.

About half the territory of these old slave States is new country, and has comparatively few slaves. On this part the increase of population has chiefly taken place. On the old slave-labored lowlands, a singular phenomenon has appeared; there, within the bounds of these rapidly grow-

ing United States, — yes, there, population has been long at a stand; yes, over wide regions, — especially in Virginia, — it has declined, and a new wilderness is gaining upon the cultivated land! What has done this work of desolation? Not war, nor pestilence; not oppression of rulers, civil or ecclesiastical; but *slavery*, a curse more destructive in its effects than any of them. It were hard to find, in old king-ridden, priest-ridden, overtaxed Europe, so large a country, where, within twenty years past, such a growing poverty and desolation have appeared.

It is in the last period of ten years, from 1830 to 1840, that this consuming plague of slavery has shown its worst effects in the old Southern States. Including the increase in their newly settled and Western counties, they gained in population only 7 1-2 per cent.; while cold, barren, thickly peopled New England gained 15, and the old middle States, 26 per cent. East Virginia actually fell off 26,000 in population; and, with the exception of Richmond and one or two other towns, her population continues to decline. Old Virginia was the first to sow this land of ours with slavery; she is also the first to reap the full harvest of destruction. Her lowland neighbors of Maryland and the Carolinas were not far behind at the *seeding*; nor are they far behind at the ingathering of desolation.

Let us take the rich and beautiful State of Kentucky, compared with her free neighbor Ohio. The slaves of Kentucky have composed less than a fourth part of her population. But mark their effect upon the comparative growth of the State. In the year 1800, Kentucky contained 221,000 inhabitants, and Ohio, 45,000. In forty years, the population of Kentucky had risen to 780,000; that of Ohio to 1,519,000. This wonderful difference could not be owing to any natural superiority of the Ohio country. Kentucky is nearly as large, nearly as fertile, and quite equal in other gifts of nature. She had greatly the advantage too in the outset of this forty years' race of population. She started with 5 1-2 inhabitants to the square mile, and came out with 20; Ohio started with one inhabitant to the square mile, and came out with 38. Kentucky had full possession of her territory at the beginning. Much of Ohio was then, and for a long time afterwards, in possession of the Indians. Ohio is by this time considerably more than twice as thickly peopled as Kentucky; yet she still gains, both by natural increase and by the influx of emigrants; while Kentucky has for twenty years been receiving much fewer emigrants than Ohio, and multitudes of her citizens have been yearly moving off to newer and yet newer countries.

Compare this natural increase with the census returns, and it appears that in the ten years from 1830 to 1840, Virginia lost by emigration no fewer than 375,000 of her people, of whom East Virginia lost 304,000 and West Virginia 71,000. At this rate Virginia supplies the West every ten years with a population equal in number to the population of the State of Mississippi in 1840!

Some Virginia politicians proudly, — yes, *proudly*, fellow-citizens, — call our old Commonwealth, *The Mother of States!* These enlightened patriots might pay her a still higher compliment, by calling her *The Grandmother of States*. For our part, we are grieved and mortified, to think of the lean and haggard condition of our venerable mother. Her black children have sucked her so dry, that now, for a long time past, she has not milk enough for her offspring, either black or white.

She has sent, — or we should rather say, she has driven, — from her soil, at least one third of all the emigrants who have gone from the old States to the new. More than another third have gone from the other old slave States. Many of these multitudes, who have left the slave States, have shunned the regions of slavery, and settled in the free countries of the West. These were generally industrious and enterprising white men, who found, by sad experience, that a country of slaves was not the country for them. It is a truth, a certain truth, that *slavery drives free laborers, — farmers, mechanics, and all, and some of the best of them too, — out of the country, and fills their places with negroes.*

It is admitted on all hands, that slave labor is better adapted to agriculture than to any other branch of industry; and that, if not good for agriculture, it is really good for nothing.

Therefore, since in agriculture slave labor is proved to be far less productive than free labor, *slavery is demonstrated to be not only unprofitable, but deeply injurious to the public prosperity.*

We do not mean that slave labor can never earn anything for him that employs it. The question is between free labor and slave labor. He that chooses to employ a sort of labor that yields only half as much to the land as another sort would yield, makes a choice that is not only unprofitable, but deeply injurious to his interest.

Agriculture in the slave States may be characterized in general by two epithets, *extensive, exhaustive*, — which in all agricultural countries forebode two things, *impoverishment, depopulation*. The general system of slaveholding farmers and planters, in all times and places, has been, and now is, and ever will be, to cultivate much land, badly, for present gain, — in short, to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. They cannot do otherwise with laborers who work by compulsion, for the benefit only of their masters; and whose sole interest in the matter is, to do as little and to consume as much as possible.

This ruinous system of large farms cultivated by slaves showed its effects in Italy, 1800 years ago, when the Roman empire was at the height of its grandeur.

Pliny, a writer of that age, in his *Natural History*, (Book 18, ch. 4-7,) tells us, that while the small farms of former times were cultivated by freemen, and even great commanders did not disdain to labor with their own hands, agriculture flourished, and provisions were abundant; but that afterwards, when the lands were engrossed by a few great proprietors, and cultivated by fettered and branded slaves, the country was ruined, and corn had to be imported. The same system was spreading ruin over the provinces, and thus the prosperity of the empire was undermined. Pliny denounces as the worst of all, the system of having large estates in the country cultivated by slaves, or indeed, says he, "to have anything done by men who labor without hope of reward."

So Livy, the great Roman historian, observed, some years before Pliny, (Book 6, ch. 12,) that "immense multitudes of men formerly inhabited those parts of Italy, where, in his time, none but slaves redeemed the country from desertion;" — that is, a dense population of free laborers had been succeeded by a sparse population of slaves.

Even the common mechanical trades do not flourish in a slave State. Some mechanical operations must, indeed, be performed in every civilized country; but the general rule in the South is, to import from abroad every fabricated thing that can be carried in ships, such as household furniture, boats, boards, laths, carts, ploughs, axes, and axchelves, besides innumerable other things, which free communities are accustomed to make for themselves. What is most wonderful is, that the forests and iron-mines of the South supply, in great part, the materials out of which these

things are made. The Northern freemen come with their ships, carry home the timber and pig-iron, work them up, supply their own wants with a part, and then sell the rest at a good profit in the Southern markets. Now, although mechanics, by setting up their shops in the South, could save all these freights and profits; yet so it is, that Northern mechanics will not settle in the South, and the Southern mechanics are undersold by their Northern competitors.

Now connect with these wonderful facts another fact, and the mystery is solved. The number of mechanics, in different parts of the South, is in the inverse ratio of the number of slaves; or in other words, where the slaves form the largest proportion of the inhabitants, there the mechanics and manufacturers form the least. In those parts only where the slaves are comparatively few, are many mechanics and artificers to be found; but even in these parts they do not flourish as the same useful class of men flourish in the free States. Even in our Valley of Virginia, remote from the sea, many of our mechanics can hardly stand against Northern competition. This can be attributed only to slavery, which paralyzes our energies, disperses our population, and keeps us few and poor, in spite of the beautiful gifts of nature, with which a benign Providence has endowed our country.

Of all the States in this Union, not one has on the whole such various and abundant resources for manufacturing, as our own Virginia, both East and West. Only think of her vast forests of timber, her mountains of iron, her regions of stone coal, her valleys of limestone and marble, her fountains of salt, her immense sheep-walks for wool, her vicinity to the cotton fields, her innumerable waterfalls, her bays, harbors and rivers for circulating products on every side; — in short, every material and every convenience necessary for manufacturing industry.

Above all, think of Richmond, nature's chosen site for the greatest manufacturing city in America — her beds of coal and iron, just at hand — her incomparable water-power — her tide water navigation, conducting sea vessels from the foot of her falls, — and above them her fine canal to the mountains, through which lie the shortest routes from the Eastern tides to the great rivers of the West and the South-west. Think also that this Richmond, in old Virginia, "the mother of States," has enjoyed these unparalleled advantages ever since the United States became a nation; — and then think again, that this same Richmond, the metropolis of all Virginia, has fewer manufactures than a third rate New England town; — fewer — not than the new city of Lowell, which is beyond all comparison, — but fewer than the obscure place called Fall River, among the barren hills of Massachusetts; — and then, fellow-citizens, what will you think, — what *must* you think, — of the cause of this strange phenomenon? Or, to enlarge the scope of the question: What *must* you think has caused Virginians in general to neglect their superlative advantages for manufacturing industry? — to disregard the evident suggestions of nature, pointing out to them this fruitful source of population, wealth and comfort?

Say not that this state of things is chargeable to the *apathy* of Virginians. That is nothing to the purpose, for it does not go to the bottom of the subject. What causes the apathy? That is the question.

The last census gave also the cost of constructing new buildings in each State, exclusive of the value of the materials. The amount of this is a good test of the increase of wealth in a country. To compare different States in this particular, we must divide the total cost of building by the number of inhabitants, and see what the average will be for each inhabitant. We find that it is in Massachusetts, \$3 60 cents; in Connecticut, \$3 50 cents; in New York, \$3 00; in New Jersey, \$2 70 cents; in Pennsylvania, \$3 10 cents; in Maryland, \$2 30 cents; and in Virginia, \$1 10 cents.

No State has greater conveniences for ship navigation and ship building than Virginia. Yet on all her fine tide waters, she has little shipping; and what she has is composed almost wholly of small bay craft and a few coasting schooners.

We do not blame our Southern people for abstaining from all employments of this kind. What could they do? Set their negroes to building ships? Who ever imagined such an absurdity? But could they not hire white men to do such things? No; for in the first place, Southern white men have no skill in such matters; and in the second place, Northern workmen cannot be hired in the South, without receiving a heavy premium for working in a slave State.

The boast of our West Virginia is the good city of Wheeling. Would that she was six times as large, that she might equal Pittsburg, and that she grew five times as fast, that she might keep up with her!

We glory in Wheeling, because she only, in Virginia, deserves to be called a manufacturing town. For this her citizens deserve to be crowned, — not with laurel, — but with the solid gold of prosperity. But how came it, that Wheeling, and next to her, Wellsburg, — of all the towns in Virginia, — should become manufacturing towns? Answer: They breathe the atmosphere of free States, almost touching them on both sides. But again; seeing that Wheeling, as a seat for manufactures, is equal to Pittsburg, and inferior to no town in America, except Richmond; and that, moreover, she has almost no slaves; why is Wheeling so far behind Pittsburg, and comparatively so slow in her growth? — Answer: She is in a country in which slavery is established by law.

We shall explain, by examples, how a few slaves in a country may do its citizens more immediate injury than a large number.

When a white family own fifty or one hundred slaves, they can, so long as their land produces well, afford to be indolent and expensive in their habits; for though each yields only a small profit, yet each member of the family has ten or fifteen of these black work-animals to toil for his support. It is not until the fields grow old, and the crops grow short, and the negroes and the overseer take nearly all that the day of ruin can be no longer postponed. If the family be not *very* indolent and *very* expensive, this inevitable day may not come before the third generation. But the ruin of small slaveholders is often accomplished in a single life-time.

When a white family own five or ten slaves, they cannot afford to be indolent and expensive in their habits; for one black drudge cannot support one white gentleman or lady. Yet, because they are slaveholders, this family will feel some aspirations for a life of easy gentility; and because field work and kitchen work are negroes' work, the young gentlemen will dislike to go with the negroes to dirty field work, and the young ladies will dislike to join the black sluts in any sort of household labor. Such unwhirlig sentiments are the natural consequence of introducing slaves among the families of a country; especially negro slaves. They infallibly grow and spread, creating among the white families a distaste for all servile labor, and a desire to procure slaves who

may take all drudgery off their hands. Thus general industry gives way by degrees to indolent relaxation, false notions of dignity and refinement, and a taste for fashionable luxuries. Then debts slyly accumulate. The result is, that many families are compelled by their embarrassments to sell off and leave the country. Many who are unable to buy slaves leave it also, because they feel degraded, and cannot prosper, where slavery exists. Citizens of the Valley! Is it not so? Is not this the chief reason why your beautiful country does not prosper like the Northern Valleys?

We have examined the census of counties for the last thirty or forty years, in Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina, with the view to discover the law of population in the Northern slave States. The following are among the general results.

When a county had at first comparatively few slaves, the slave population, except near the free borders, gained upon the whites, and most rapidly in the older parts of the country.

The population, as a whole, increased so long as the slaves were fewer than the whites, but more slowly as the numbers approached to equality. In our Valley, a smaller proportion of slaves had the effect of a larger one in East Virginia, to retard the increase of population.

When the slaves became as numerous as the whites in the Eastern and older parts of the country, population came to a stand; when they outnumbered the whites, it declined. Consequently, the slave population has tended to diffuse itself equally over the country, rising more rapidly as it was further below the white population, and going down when it had risen above them.

The price of cotton has regulated the price of negroes in Virginia; and so it must continue to do; because slave labor is unprofitable here, and nothing keeps up the price of slaves but their value as a marketable commodity in the South. Eastern negroes and Western cattle are alike in this, that, if the market abroad go down or be closed, — both sorts of animals, the horned and the woolly-headed, become a worthless drug at home. The fact is, that our Eastern brethren must send off, on any terms, the increase of their slaves, because their impoverished country cannot sustain even its present stock of negroes. We join not the English and American abolition cry about "slave-breeding," in East Virginia, as if it were a chosen occupation, and therefore a reproachful one. It is no such thing, but a case of dire necessity, and many a heartache does it cost the good people there. But, behold in the East the doleful consequences of letting slavery grow up to an oppressive and heart-sickening burden upon a community! Cast it off, West Virginians, whilst yet you have the power; for if you let it descend unbroken to your children, it will have grown to a mountain of misery upon their heads.

Good policy will require the Southern States, ere long, to close their markets against Northern negroes. When the Southern slave market is closed, or when, by the reduced profits of slave labor in the South, it becomes glutted; — then the stream of Virginia negroes, heretofore pouring down upon the South, will be thrown back upon the State, and like a river dammed up, must spread itself over the whole territory of the commonwealth. The head spring in East Virginia cannot contain itself; it must find vent; it will shed its black streams through every gap of the Blue Ridge and pour over the Alleghany, till it is checked by abolitionism on the borders. But even abolitionism cannot finally stop it. Abolitionism itself will tolerate slavery, when slaveholders grow sick and tired of it.

In plain terms, fellow-citizens, Eastern slaveholders will come with their multitudes of slaves to settle upon the fresh lands of West Virginia. Eastern slaves will be sent by thousands for a market in West Virginia. Every valley will echo with the cry, "Negroes! Negroes for sale! Dog cheap! Dog cheap!" And because they are dog cheap, many of our people will buy them. We have shown how slavery has prepared the people for this; how a little slavery makes way for more, and how the law of slave-increase operates to fill up every part of the country to the same level with slaves.

And then, fellow-citizens, when you have suffered your country to be filled with negro slaves instead of white freemen; when its population shall be as motley as Joseph's coat of many colors; as ring-streaked and speckled as father Jacob's flock was in Padan Aram; — what will the white basis of representation avail you, if you obtain it? Whether you obtain it or not, East Virginia will have triumphed; or rather *slavery* will have triumphed, and all Virginia will have become a land of darkness and of the shadow of death.

Then, by a forbearance which has no merit, and a supineness which has no excuse, you will have given to your children, for their inheritance, this lovely land blackened with a negro population, — the offscourings of Eastern Virginia, — the fag-end of slavery, — the loathsome dregs of that cup of abomination, which has already sickened to death the Eastern half of our commonwealth.

Delay not, then, we beseech you, to raise a barrier against this Stygian inundation, — to stand at the Blue Ridge, and with sovereign energy say to this Black Sea of misery, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further."